

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 8, 1862.

A MOVEMENT is now on foot in favour of raising the dignity and emoluments, and extending the jurisdiction, of county court judges. A letter\* to the Lord Chancellor has been published, in which the writer insists that "the system has yet never been completely developed, and that much remains to be done to secure the full benefit of its original design." The main suggestions which he makes, are as follows:—That the judges ought to get better salaries, as they are at present treated in "a pitiable spirit of parsimony;" to abolish the concurrent jurisdiction of the courts at Westminster in cases not exceeding £20; to do away with *certioraris*, and to enact that prohibitions shall not issue "except on a motion to show cause founded upon affidavit to be made absolute only by a Court in Banco;" to place county court judges in the Assize Commission; and to relieve them from jurisdiction in bankruptcy. The writer is probably a county court judge, as his enthusiasm seems mainly directed towards augmenting the grandeur, and increasing the pay, of these officials. He tells us that the Treasury derives a large annual revenue from fees paid by county court suitors, and that the amount so levied in the year ending 31st December, 1860, exceeded a quarter of a million—£226,738. He does not inform his readers that the Treasury expends, in paying the salaries of the county court judges and other expenses belonging to those tribunals, not only the whole of this annual revenue, but at least another quarter of a million per annum, which, surely, is as much as at present it can well afford to expend in collecting the debts of tallymen and other small traders throughout the country. A short time since we undertook to show that instead of maintaining the existing system of county courts at the present expense, it would be almost as cheap for the Government to pay every shilling of the debts recovered in the whole of the county courts of England.

THE Solicitors' Benevolent Association has resolved upon having its Annual Dinner on behalf of the charity in May next, when it is expected that an unusually great number of country members will be attracted to town by the Great Exhibition. Mr. James Anderton, the chairman of the Association, having on its behalf applied to Lord Chelmsford to take the chair on the occasion, his lordship has cordially consented to do so, as appears by the following letter addressed to Mr. Anderton:—

Eaton Square, 22nd Feb., 1862.

My dear sir,—I cannot account for your letter being overlooked, except from the circumstance of my having just returned from abroad, and finding it with a great number of others.

In my haste I must have failed to collect the purport of it, as I have no recollection of having read such an application as is contained in the copy of the letter which you have sent me. Had I done so, I should instantly have returned an answer accepting the honour which it offered. I have too great a respect for the body of solicitors not to be happy to be afforded an opportunity of testifying it in any manner which is agreeable to them. I regret very much that from my inadvertence or oversight, the interests of the charity should have been prejudiced by the unfortunate delay which has taken place. The only atonement which I can make (though a very insufficient one) is to save the directors of the association the trouble of sending me a deputation, by accepting at once and with pleasure, the office of chairman at the proposed dinner. You will be good enough to let me know when the day is fixed; and I

may as well mention that a Wednesday or Saturday would be the most convenient for me.—Yours faithfully,  
James Anderton, Esq. CHELMSFORD.

THE Queen has been pleased to direct letters patent to be passed under the Great Seal, granting the dignity of a Knight of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland unto Edmund Grimani Hornby, Esq., the Judge of the Supreme Consular Court of Constantinople.

MR. RICHARD COUCH, of the Norfolk Circuit, Recorder of Bedford, has been appointed a judge of the High Court about to be established at Bombay.

MR. FRANCIS WILLIAM MOUNT, of Forest Hill, Kent, and 17A, Size-lane, City, has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

### ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS REFORM.

There are few subjects of greater importance to any community than the administration of justice; of which the great desiderata may be defined to be that the application of the law to each individual case should be certain, speedy, unattended with unnecessary expense, and administered by competent and impartial judges, who should have no personal interest, either in the event or the continuance of the litigation. So strongly has this been felt by all persons who have given any attention to the matter, that it is a maxim generally received, that "bad laws well administered are better than good laws badly administered;" that is to say, that if the law, such as it is, be certainly, fairly, and speedily brought home to every man's door, even though the principles of that law may not be in accordance with abstract justice, the state of society is, on the whole, better than it would be under a system of law theoretically perfect, the administration of which was vested in corrupt or incompetent officers, or was incumbered by unnecessary and perplexing formalities, or inordinate expense or delay. This maxim is, of course, subject to this qualification, that the law must not entirely abrogate the only legitimate function of human law, the maintenance of society, and the security of life and property.

These remarks are elicited by a pamphlet which has lately come to our notice under the heading "Ecclesiastical Courts, Laws, and Commission," containing a scheme apparently settled by Mr. Stephens, Q.C., and adopted by Mr. Henry Seymour, M.P., for the reform of the administration of justice in church matters. And it may fairly be confessed that the present condition of the Bishops' Courts is most unsatisfactory, and that these Courts possess scarcely one (if any) of the qualifications above-mentioned. The judges are, in many instances, necessarily inferior, both in knowledge and intellectual power, to the able and experienced advocates with whose arguments they have, in all important cases, to deal; the procedure is cumbersome and expensive to an extravagant degree; the decree is not unfrequently delayed for years; the Court can only be set in motion, in the first instance, after a useless and vexatious preliminary investigation; and in the "Causes Célèbres" of modern days in these courts it has rarely happened that the decision, when arrived at, turned upon the real merits of the case. All these objections loudly call for reform; in every other department of our law the constitution of and procedure in the Courts have been remodelled or improved. First came the abolition of real actions, those pitfalls of legal ingenuity, whose principal end seems to have been to preclude the possibility of any case ever going to issue on the merits; then the two great Acts of 1852, which simplified and expedited the procedure in the superior courts of law and equity to a degree which seems to leave little yet to be attained in that direction; then the Acts rescuing the jurisdiction in testamentary and matrimonial matters from

\* On the Working of the County Courts. A Letter to the Right Hon. Baron Westbury, Lord High Chancellor. By Vigil. Stevens, Sons and Haynes.  
† Ante, p. 152.

the grasp of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and establishing a tribunal which seems in *those respects* (the new jurisdiction conferred in matters of divorce belongs to a somewhat different subject) almost perfect; then the improvement of the procedure and practice of the Court of Admiralty; till the sole remaining blot on our judicial system is the state of the Ecclesiastical Courts, a state, perhaps, only tolerated because their jurisdiction is now so limited that but a comparatively small class suffer from their defects.

But to agree with the hon. member for Poole in the urgent necessity of *some* reform, and to subscribe to the proposed reform, are two very different things; and we now propose, as briefly as possible, to point out principal objections to Mr. Stephens's scheme, and the modifications thereof which we consider to be indispensable.

The first proposition amounts to this, that all the "exactions" of which Mr. Seymour so forcibly complains in his letter are to remain unaltered, while the persons who reap the profit thereof are to have their places converted into sinecures. Now as the new courts which must be constituted, will, of necessity, require a considerable staff of officers, and as few, if any, of the officers of the existing Ecclesiastical Courts are employed solely as such officers, it seems to us fully to meet the justice of the case to provide that in the appointment of the permanent staff of the new courts such of the officers of the existing courts as have no other occupation are to have the preference, and that the remaining officers are to be bound to afford such assistance as they have been accustomed, at salaries calculated on an average of their existing fees. The registries might in like manner be transferred to the existing Probate Registries, the present scale of fees being for the present maintained and paid into a common fund to meet all the salaries connected exclusively with this business, such fees to be reduced as and when practicable, until they become assimilated to the fees in the probate business.

The third proposition also appears to us to involve unnecessary expense to the country. It is now very generally admitted that the duties of the Courts of Probate and Divorce are so onerous that the clause (20 & 21 Vict. c. 77, s. 10) for amalgamating the offices of Judge of those courts and of the Admiralty will of necessity become a dead letter; and it would appear very reasonable, therefore, to provide instead thereof that the proposed Ecclesiastical judge and the judge of the Court of Admiralty should be the same person. The present eminent judge of the latter court is also Dean of the Arches at present; and in order to avoid even the appearance of interfering with his rights, it might be provided that during his life and the lives of any of the existing judges of Bishops' Courts, he should be entitled to require their assistance in return for the salaries herein proposed to be secured to them. The case is not quite the same in Ireland; but similar provisions, too long and too personal for insertion in an article of this nature, will suggest themselves to anyone acquainted with the existing judicial body in that country.

The sixth proposition seems to us objectionable in not giving the bishops the power there confined to the archbishops; and we think it would be well to substitute for the sixth and seventh propositions a provision enabling any person, lay or clerical, to file an information in the name of the bishop in the new court in the same manner in which informations are now filed in Chancery, (which should not be proceeded with until the bishop's or archbishop's signature had been obtained), and making the issue of letters of request a necessary consequence of such signature (the informant being subject to costs in the same manner as a relator now is in the Court of Chancery), and enabling any bishop or archbishop, *ex mero motu suo*, to file an official information, and proceed thereon at once as of right. The procedure in the court ought to be as nearly as possible assimilated to the improved procedure

of courts of equity, subject to general orders to be made by the Lord Chancellor and the Judge of the court.

The eighth proposition is manifestly unfair and improper, unless all Irish privy councillors who hold, or have held, any office in Ireland which, if holden in England, would have made an English privy councillor a member of the Judicial Committee, shall be entitled to a seat on the Committee in all appeals from either country, and unless Irish barristers shall be given the same right of audience before this Court that they now have in the House of Lords. See how oppressively the proposed change would act upon all Irish litigants, if, after they had at great trouble and expense instructed counsel well acquainted with Irish ecclesiastical law in the merits of their cases, the whole matter had to be gone through over again with a new set of counsel, unacquainted perhaps with the peculiarities of the law as bearing upon the case in hand, and before a new tribunal not adapted for the decision of Irish matters. Besides, an appeal from Ireland to England is unconstitutional and in direct violation of the Act of Union and the Declaration of Independence. *The House of Lords* is not England, but *neutral*, or rather *common*, ground.

However, with the modifications here specified, we see no objection to the eighth and ninth propositions, except the proposed interference with the right of appeal in actions of *quare impedit*. It is not easy to see any ground for interfering with the jurisdiction of the House of Lords as a court of appeal from the Court of Common Pleas.

On the whole we are much obliged to Mr. Seymour for his pamphlet; and we think him deserving of the gratitude of all well-wishers to the English judiciary for the trouble he has taken with reference to this matter; and though we are not sanguine enough to hope for any sufficient action on the part of the Government or the people in the present session, notwithstanding the sort of half promise which was made, or supposed to have been made, by the Solicitor-General a few nights ago, to the effect that a bill of some sort on this subject should be brought in (which has not yet been done), yet we trust that this may be the commencement of a movement which will ultimately be crowned with success.

#### LAND TRANSFER SCHEMES. NO. III.

##### GUARANTEE AND INSURANCE OF TITLE.

We cannot return to the consideration of the 20th section of Lord Westbury's Bill without feeling that if the 119th section had never been inserted for the purpose of providing a guarantee fund for the satisfaction of the owners of interests in registered estates, who may be prejudiced by the granting of Parliamentary titles, there would (assuming the principle of this measure to be satisfactory) be a sufficient protection to those interests in the proper enforcement of the rules and conditions of the procedure sketched out in Part I. of the Bill. The discretion given to the Registrar, as to requiring evidence of any kind, is so ample, the power conferred upon any of the parties to refer any point to the Court of Chancery is so absolute, and the scheme for mentioning in the Record of Title any exception, qualification, or condition, is so simple and sensible, that we at least cannot persuade ourselves either that the Bill, as it stands, is what it might have been, or that it will effect quite as much as it was intended to do. If the idea of the Bill is that owners of estates are to have the power of insuring their titles by payment to the State of a premium in the shape of Court fees, the risk being accepted only after the prescribed tribunal has most carefully and completely ascertained that the guarantee may and should be given, why should that guarantee extend to protect the insured only in the event of his dealing

to sell for valuable consideration some interest in the property covered by the insurance? Why should not the guarantee preclude the liability to any claim upon the title, other than such as might be duly recorded before the registration was made? The plan proposed, of simply stating upon the Record of Title, every charge and interest upon the estate, which is made and proved in due time, seems to give little in the way of indefeasibility—inasmuch as that record will not, according to the Bill, be completed unless it contains an account verified by oath of every interest, vested or contingent, present or future; and there will, therefore, be nothing left to protect the landowners against, except what either the Registrar, after careful public inquiry, or the parties applying, or their solicitors, under the penalties of perjury, will not reveal. And if this indefeasibility, when obtained, is to be so limited in the extent of the guarantee which it confers, surely there is very little offered by the bill except a public investigation, and the ultimate statement, on a semi-public record, by a novel and categorical method of indexing, of the real state of the title.

#### EXTENT OF GUARANTEE.

We mentioned in our remarks in the last number of this Journal a doubt which occurred to us, whether the 119th section, read with the 126th, did not enable prejudiced claimants to open the whole of the proceedings, even after the granting of a Parliamentary title? That doubt, if it was well founded, extended to affect the validity of a declaration of title, whether a dealing for valuable consideration was or was not in question, and consequently we may find that, under the new system, the State insurance of a title will amount to no guarantee at all, but will be merely a revealing of every weakness in the applicant's title, and the strengthening or revival or perfecting of adverse claims which would probably have been lost if they had been permitted to lie quiet; and it is not improbable that, with these results as the consequences of applying the system to their properties, many landowners who might desire the advantage of a genuine insurance, which would be really a guarantee of indefeasibility, will avoid the new plan as an idle expense and a dangerous thing to meddle with. Whether we are right or not in our suggestion of the doubts above referred to upon the construction of the Bill as it stands, it is, we think, evident that the guarantee is not made obligatory to such an extent as to render it really the most prominent characteristic, for good or evil, of the new scheme. And in proportion as one may determine the extent of the guarantee to be considerable or inconsiderable, the other purposes of the Measure, namely, the facilitating and simplifying the transfer of land, become more or less worthy of attention and criticism. Now, suppose that the guarantee conferred by the registration of a Parliamentary title extends to render the ownership absolute and indefeasible, excepting as regards interests revealed in the Record of Title and in the Registry of Incumbrances, and it is the purpose of a registered owner to sell the property, is it probable that the scheduled forms of transfer, as considered under the prescribed interpretation of their purpose, and enforced application, will do so much towards facilitating and simplifying dealings with real property, as to be satisfactory in theory and promise.

#### INCONVENIENCES OF PROPOSED PLANS.

The methods of transferring registered land are pointed out in Part IV. of the Bill. It may be transferred in either of four ways: by a statutory disposition in such of the scheduled forms as may be appropriate to the occasion; by endorsement on the land certificate; by deposit of the land certificate, (an act which, it will be perceived, is to be equivalent in purpose and consequences to an equitable mortgage); and

lastly, by any deed or instrument which, under the present system, would validly transfer the prescribed estate or interest, subject however to the provisions of the Bill with reference to the registration and official noting and copying of such deed or instrument. If the first-named method of transfer is chosen (and in passing, we may observe that this is the method which the Bill proposes to render as universal as possible; inasmuch as it is the method which obviates the necessity of recitals and covenants and the old verbosity which it is the purpose of the Bill to put an end to) "upon every disposition of any registered land, or of any estate therein, the parties or their duly authorised agents may attend at the Registry Office;" if that expression by itself might imply a discretion in the parties concerned to complete their sales and dispositions in the country or anywhere else, the concluding language of the same section seems imperative. It enacts that the description of the land shall be taken from the Registry of Estates and Record of Title, and inserted, *under the superintendence of the Registrar*, in one of the statutory forms of conveyance, and such conveyances shall be executed by the parties or their agents, *in the presence of and attested by (among others) such officials as the Registrar shall appoint, and shall then and there (together with the powers of attorney) be delivered to the Registrar for the purpose of registration, who shall make the proper entries in the register accordingly.*

Now let us apply this scheme of procedure to a simple and probable instance. The tenant for life, under a family settlement of property, by which interests in remainder are vested in successive tenants for lives and tenants in tail, and by which jointures, and portions, and annuities, and mortgage interests are either created or affected, proposes to sell an acre of land of the value of £40, situate anywhere, Berwick-on-Tweed or Truro, it matters not which. There are two or three different sets of trustees, and perhaps not not improbably, fifteen or twenty persons interested in the transaction, who, under the present system, would or might be proper parties. All these persons are to lose the power and opportunity which they have hitherto enjoyed, of considering, with the advice and assistance of their private advisers, what their precise rights and most prudent course of action may be. They must attend in London, all at the same time, for it will be impossible to transact a business of this kind piecemeal, and the Bill contemplates the exercise of discretion by the Registrar, which affects the interests of all concerned, and which discretion, for that reason, will be exercised in the presence of all. If powers of attorney are executed, it will be necessary to scrutinize and prove them carefully, for the transfer, if made, is to bind all the persons concerned. Any one of those persons who is suspicious or captious, may decline to concur and may drag all the rest before the Judge in chambers or take the matter into the Court of Chancery. If the new scheme is accepted and used, how many thousand transactions in conveyancing will take place every day, and who can predict how many thousand difficulties will not occur, arising from defects in powers of attorney, the absence of parties concerned, the occurrence of irregularities or discrepancies in the official records, the inconsistencies existing between registered private muniments of title, and the official indexes. Let our readers consider, for instance, whether difficulties are not obviously probable upon the application of the 75th, the 76th, and the 77th sections, read, as they must be, with the 150th, to some of the most usual transactions in dealing with estates. Registered proprietors may convey their land by the scheduled forms of conveyance, and the same shall be as complete and effectual as any other form of conveyance would have been either at law or in equity; the grantees, who take under the scheduled forms, shall take as fully and effectually as if the estates rights, powers, and authori-



ties expressed to be created and given by such forms, had been conveyed, created, or granted by any of the modes of assurance now known to law. The scheduled forms may be modified or altered in expression to suit the circumstances of every case, and the conveyances made in such altered forms shall be equally valid and effectual. But the 150th section is imperative—"The forms in the schedule hereto shall be used in all matters to which they refer; the Registrar, with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor (not the parties, of their own mere motion to suit themselves) may from time to time make such alterations in such scheduled forms as he deems requisite; he is to publish any form, when altered, in the *Gazette*, and upon such publication the form is to have the same effect as if it were included in the schedule to the Act. Now, we ask whether a difference of opinion is not almost certain to arise in the minds of any two persons who may be put to construe those sections of Lord Westbury's Bill, especially upon the occasion of their having to apply them to a transaction in which the rights of both the expounding parties are concerned. Would it not be reasonable for one to insist that the earlier sections of the Bill enable buyer and seller and trustees and tenants in remainder and incumbrancers to recite all their interests and to introduce apt provisions and limitations, and words of grant which are more exactly appropriate to the occasion than a simple absolute "grant" from "A. B. to C. D. &c.?" Might it not be further insisted that the scheduled forms become almost entirely useless, if they are to be applicable only to such simple, and, in these days, to such unusual transactions, as those suggested by the forms? On the other hand, is it merely a captious argument to affirm that inasmuch as the 150th section stands alone as the single section of the Bill which relates to "forms," it is to be considered as the ruling enactment so far as the purport and obligation of those forms are concerned; and that inasmuch as the language of that section is imperative, that the Registrar, "with the sanction of the Lord Chancellor," and not without, is to make alterations in the scheduled forms, which, unless they are so altered, are to be "used in all matters to which they refer," it is out of the power of any private individual, and clearly out of the power of the Registrar, to make alterations. And supposing that it is settled that the 150th section has some operation which we cannot at present discover, if it is to mean something which it does not say, and to enact something which it does not seem to mention, the limits of the discretion of altering which the parties or the Registrar may use, will not be ascertained without much litigation—or, at least, without a great deal of trouble and delay. We believe that even if the Registrar finds that he can manage to keep a perfect contemporaneous account of every transaction with registered land all over England, and a complete index of every birth, death, and marriage which in any way affects the title of the many hundred thousand acres of which he will have the public stewardship, he will not be able to prevent the insertion of exactly the same recitals and provisions in the so-called statutory forms as are now contained in private conveyancing; because it will be impossible, or, at least, entirely and manifestly improper and unjust, to prevent landholders from creating estates and interests, and from stating intentions as precisely and freely under the new system as they can and do now under the old one. But if there are to be recitals, there will be covenants—the thin end of the wedge will have been inserted—the Registrar has hardly any judicial discretion given to him by the Bill; he will not obstruct half the public conveyancing of the country by referring every landholder who desires to say exactly what he means in his statutory documents, to the Court of Chancery; nor will he prevent the parties from inserting stipulations, which, under the

guise of conditional limitations, will gradually and invisibly develop by habit into explicit covenants.

We shall thus have, probably, in a few years, much the same conveyancing as we manage now privately (and that it is managed almost perfectly, is everywhere admitted)—done in a public office in London, by an over-worked official, who will have been obliged to desert the *modus operandi* planned for him by Lord Westbury. Country gentlemen will charge their estates after public advertisement, and the industrious notice of their intentions to all their neighbours; their daughters' portions will be published to anyone who reads the newspapers in the district in which the ladies live; in other words, men will lose the privacy which they value as much as anything else in their dealings with their own property: they will not gain the simple, easy, speedy, inexpensive method of conveyancing which they desire, but they will be hampered (irretrievably, if anyone who has any interest in their land is spiteful or desirous of annoying them) by the obligation of keeping their property on the register, and, consequently, upon every transaction of transfer they must submit to lose the power of doing what they like with their own; they will have to express themselves as the Act directs, they cannot compromise or get in outstanding interests, and the influence of private arrangements, and the exercise of individual forethought and shrewdness, will all be merged in the hurried swing of public business.

#### NON-GUARANTEED TITLES.

The plan proposed in Lord Westbury's Bill for the registration of estates, without a guarantee of title, is, we suppose, intended to satisfy the desire of those landowners who may be anxious to avail themselves of the new system, but who do not desire to sell, and who cannot obtain either a title with a guarantee, or a declaration of title from the Court of Chancery, because they cannot, as is necessary for either of those things, make a valid marketable title. The limited or conditional guarantee is to be given after the same semi-public investigation of the applicant's title, and the same public advertisements of his application, and of the Registrar's proceedings upon it, as are prescribed in the case of applications for Parliamentary titles; but, as we have mentioned already, we do not think that this method of conditional guarantee will be generally acceptable, for it seems to be principally applicable to those cases in which there is some inchoate right to an absolute interest in the applicant, and we imagine that the rules of law, which obtain already, in respect of the ultimate vesting of property by adverse possession, would give the ownership in a far larger number of cases than those in which it would be obtained after public advertisement of the adverse claimant's intention to enjoy, at the end of the statutory term, and after his public invitation to the disseised owners to assert their failing rights of property, and to interrupt the adverse enjoyment before it had been clothed by lapse of time with the legal ownership. We presume that the Registrar is not to have the power to alter the periods of limitation fixed in the doctrines of the present jurisprudence of the country, although the language of the fifth heading of the 24th section is large enough to give him such a discretion. The Lord Chancellor, in introducing the Bill, said "he did not want to introduce any alteration in the system of the legal rights of ownership." If the Registrar really is to have a discretion to qualify or shorten the periods of limitation or to introduce modifications and alter conditions of obtaining or retaining land, at the instance of a conditional owner, and upon an *ex parte* and private application by him, that discretion is evidently impolitic and improper, because it is to be given to an inferior official, to whom a general judicial authority in other and analogous matters, does not appear to be given, and who will not act in the presence of the



public, nor necessarily after direct notice to the parties who are to be prejudiced; in fact, it will be a discretion larger than any which is permitted at present to any Court in the Kingdom. We do not, therefore, believe that the language of the section we are dealing with, has been carefully considered, and it is evidently necessary that the Bill should not pass as it stands; there is enough in the doubt and in the obvious consequences of it, to induce a fearful amount of litigation. The section provides in substance that any person may apply for registration without a guarantee of title, subject to the conditions that he shall prove, to the Registrar's satisfaction, that he or some person under whom he claims has been in the actual enjoyment or receipt of rents of the land as owner of the fee simple, continuously and without interruption, for ten years immediately preceding the application, and the last deed or will (if any), under which the applicant derives title, is to be produced to the Registrar. The object of this conditional granting of title is the future or ultimate vesting of the fee simple in the applicant; and the bill is with that object drawn in such a way as to afford such a benefit to those persons only who claim the fee simple—a person who had a power of appointment only or who was only tenant for life, and who applied together with the tenant in remainder, or who was a tenant in common only, would, we apprehend, according to the received doctrines of limitation not be one in whom an inchoate estate could ripen into an absolute fee simple. In cases in which the application is made by persons who are in adverse possession, the actual enjoyment and receipt of rents "as owner of the fee" will have to be considered as possession or receipt analogous to what they would have been "in the case of an owner of the fee." If the applicant claims as heir-at-law, evidence is to be given that the ancestor was "in enjoyment of the estate as owner" at the time of his decease, so that if the ancestor had happened to die a week after dispossession, and his heir had re-entered a week after his death, although that would not, according to the present doctrine of law, constitute any interruption of the adverse enjoyment, it would, according to the section of the Bill which we are considering, prevent such heir, even at the end of nineteen years from the commencement of the ancestor's enjoyment, from obtaining any guarantee of title upon any terms—whether this consequence was foreseen and intended is another matter. Then, the same procedure *mutatis mutandis* is to be had and taken by and before the Registrar, as is prescribed in case of an application for a Parliamentary title—but a statutory declaration only, and not the oaths of applicant and solicitor, are required before the non-guaranteeing registration is made—the reason of which we cannot perceive, unless it consists in this, that the parties may well be called on to swear, where an absolute estate is granted to them, whereas they may seem not to merit such an obligation, where they are to take nothing more than a conditional property. If the land is registered with conditional title, the Registrar is in the Record of Title to define the time, event, or circumstances from and after which a guarantee of title shall attach. When the time has arrived, the event happened, or the circumstances exist, a judge in Chancery may, upon proof thereof, and if there be no other objection, direct a transfer to the Registry of Estates with a guarantee of title, and the applicants are to have in respect of the property the same estates, rights, and privileges, as if the land had been registered with a guarantee of title. This provision necessitates a further investigation which is to be judicial—it implies the opportunity of conflicting issues in law and in fact, and the expense and delay of trying them. We do not affirm that this procedure is not necessary and sensible, but we assert that the bringing every non-guaranteed title under judi-

cial cognizance, and the proving, after inviting and upsetting all objections, that such title ought to be guaranteed, promise great delay, expense, and vexation, and are grievances which in our judgment go far to counterbalance any advantages offered by the scheme. The sixth head of the 24th section provides that the registration of a non-guaranteed title shall not prejudice any estate, right, or interest, created or existing at or before the date of the registration. By the 25th section, leasehold interests, of which fifty years are unexpired, or of which two lives are still subsisting, may be registered in an analogous manner to that prescribed in reference to freehold estates, but no guarantee obtained by a lessee shall extend to affect the title of the lessor.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS AS TO TITLE.

The Bill then proceeds to deal with what are termed "General Provisions as to Title," and these relate to some of those incidents to property which, in our opinion, can hardly be brought within any plan of registration. As Lord Kingsdown affirmed in the House of Lords on Monday evening, so we affirm that the system of registration, whatever may be its merits, will not remedy complication nor prevent expense, and that it will produce greater evils than it will correct. The following charges and liabilities are not to be deemed incumbrances within the meaning of the Act—namely (1), land tax, succession duty tithe rent-charges, rents payable to the Crown; (2) Public rights of way, liability to repair highways by reason of tenure, rights of way, water-courses and rights of water, manorial rights and franchises; (3) leases or agreements for leases not exceeding twenty-one years where there is an actual occupation under the same. Nevertheless, where any such charges or liabilities appear or are discovered in the course of proceeding prior to registration, the Registrar shall, in such manner as he shall think fit, notice in the register the existence of such charges or liabilities. It seems difficult to put a clear meaning upon the words "notice the existence of," for they may imply that the Registrar is to assess and determine at once the annual amount for all time of a fluctuating or irregular charge, or they may mean that he is not to notice any charge or liability which is not either absolute or presently obligatory upon the title at the time of registration; and even if he ascertains after inquiry what the probable amount of the charge may be and when it accrues, it may be argued that the obligation of determining the nature or character of the charge is forced upon him, and if this be so, the performance of such a duty will give room for so much difference of opinion, that we anticipate great grievances based upon this section. Land may be registered either as one estate or as separate estates; and if there be any legal condition affecting the enjoyment of any land, as, for example, that it is not to be built upon, notice of the condition is to be entered on the Record of Title—the parties are to go to the Court of Chancery if they or any of them desire to discharge, alter, or modify such condition. This provision is another evidence of the litigious character of Lord Westbury's Bill—another proof in support of our argument that the owners of registered land in their future dealings with it will be bound hand and foot without counter-balancing advantages in simplicity, facility, and expedition in procedure. Will not our readers agree that the compromise of adverse claims, the nice adjustment of relative obligations, and the release of conditions, are things which are every day managed by private arrangement, in which each party concerned can act in his own interest just as he considers it to be the most expedient for him to act, very much better and very much more cheaply than they can be managed by any judge sitting in a public court.

As soon as land is registered, the Registrar is to give notice of the registration to the owner of any charge or incumbrance, which is entered on the Registry of Incumbrances, where such owner has not had notice of the application to register. After registration every estate, right, title, &c., arising, or in any manner coming into existence, is to be described or noticed in the Record of Title. Registered owners are "subject to the enactments" contained in the Bill (a condition which it is impossible to interpret, without the aid of a great number of leading cases), to have the power to deal with these interests according to the ordinary rules of law and equity; and they may close the register by removing their land from the public records, upon obtaining the consent of all persons appearing by the register to be interested in such land. If there are infants or unborn or unascertained persons, or even persons *sui juris* with vested interests, who are ill-disposed or timid, this power of closing the register will be either suspended or virtually nothing.

## CAVEATS.

Lord Westbury provides only one kind of caveat, and the purpose of it is the enabling persons who claim interests in land to ensure direct notice to themselves of any application for registration which such persons might desire to oppose, or at least to attend. Sir H. Cairns provided two kinds of caveat—one, which seems to be the prototype of Lord Westbury's, the other by inhibitions, which, as we have already seen, were caveats entered by the Court, and were of a formal and prominent character, put on the register for the purpose of protecting contingent interests, or the future rights of persons not as yet *sui juris*. It does not seem clear that caveats under the Lord Chancellor's Bill may be entered to prevent dealings with land which is already registered, but such caveats may be entered to prevent registration, and if the public generally incline to the same doubts as those which possess us, as to the probable difficulties and the fetters of Registration, it is very likely that a large number of caveats will be entered with the Registrar, as soon as Lord Westbury's Bill becomes law. The cautioners are to make an affidavit stating the nature of their interests and such other matters as the Registrar may require. And if this provision is not sufficient to prevent the vexatious filing of caveats by persons who have no right to object to the registration of a property, the 37th section will give the landowner who is aggrieved or obstructed by them, a remedy against uninterested and malicious cautioners in the shape of "such compensation as may be just," although we are not informed how the remedy is to be obtained; and the 38th section provides that no caveat shall prejudice the claim or title of any person, and shall have no effect whatever except to entitle the cautioner to receive notice of any application for registration of land. We presume that a caveat would entitle the cautioner who files it to notice of any application to sell or mortgage an estate already registered, although, as we stated just now, that does not seem clear from the Bill as it stands. If the principle of affording to interested persons the means of ensuring direct notice of any dealing with land on which they have or may have claims, is a sound one, it is surely narrowed improperly in application, if it is not to be applied to protect claimants against any such dealings, whether they relate to the first registration of the land or to subsequent transfers or transactions. We are disposed to believe that the omission of the Lord Chancellor to introduce Sir H. Cairns' "inhibitions" is satisfactory, for we think that the Judges in Chancery will have quite sufficient jurisdiction as the Bill stands, in direction and restraint of registered landowners; and we prefer liberty of action, however little there may be, to the bestowment of a judicial discretion which would probably be held to be imperatively applicable in any case in which occasion offered the opportunity of using it.

We believe, moreover, that Lord Westbury's Bill, as it stands, contains sufficient safeguards for the protection of contingent interests. Y. Z.

## The Courts.

## COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

(In Banco.)

Feb. 27.—*Cox and Others v. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London*.—This was a declaration in prohibition to restrain certain proceedings in foreign attachment in the Lord Mayor's Court. The circumstances under which the case arose and this mode of procedure was adopted were as follows:—

On the 17th September, 1860, Buckmaster & Co., commenced an action in the Mayor's Court against one R. A. Farquharson, for the sum of £86 for goods sold and delivered. On the same day an attachment was issued against Messrs. Cox & Co., the army agents, and served upon them within the city of London, to attach all monies belonging to the defendant Farquharson in their hands. To this attachment Messrs. Cox & Co. duly appeared; but on the 11th January, 1861, Mr. Montagu Chambers on their behalf obtained in the Court of Exchequer a rule *nisi* calling upon the corporation of London and the plaintiffs (Buckmaster & Co.) to show cause why a writ of prohibition should not issue to prohibit the Court from proceeding further in the process for foreign attachment, on the ground that that Court had not jurisdiction. It then appeared that neither the plaintiffs (Buckmaster & Co.), nor the defendant, nor the garnishees (Cox & Co.), dwelt or carried on business in the city at the time of action brought, or before that time; and further that Farquharson's debt to Buckmaster & Co. was contracted out of the jurisdiction. In respect of the funds of Farquharson in the hands of Cox & Co., these were considered by the Mayor's Court to be within its jurisdiction, by reason merely of one of the partners, when within the city, having been served with the attachment by the Sergeant-at-Mace.

On the 30th January, 1861, Sir Fitzroy Kelly, Q.C., attended to show cause, and stated a preliminary objection to the granting of the writ of prohibition founded on the local Act 20 & 21 Vict. c. 157, s. 15, which states that "no defendant shall be permitted to object to the jurisdiction of the Court in or by any proceedings whatsoever, except by plea." The Court, doubting whether this section applied to a garnishee as well as to a defendant, and being of opinion that this and the general question would be best argued by declaring in prohibition, Messrs. Cox & Co. (the present plaintiffs) declared accordingly.

The defendants pleaded the custom of foreign attachment, and to this and other pleas there were demurrers and replications traversing the respective allegations.

On the 20th November, 1861, Russel Gurney, Recorder of the City, attended at Westminster, and certified the custom, which, as certified, was sufficiently extensive to embrace the present case. After hearing the arguments, in which, on the part of the plaintiffs, it was contended that the custom was wrongly certified, being different from that in former certificates, or if not, that it was bad in law, the Court took time to consider their judgment. This was given on the 27th February, 1862, unanimously in favour of the plaintiffs declaring in prohibition, but the Court were not at that time prepared to give the reasons upon which their judgment was founded.

As soon as these shall have been delivered, the case will be given at length in the *Weekly Reporter*.

## BANKRUPTCY.

(Before the LORDS JUSTICES.)

Feb. 27.—*Ex parte Potts, In re Potts*.—Mr. Bacon applied for leave to read new evidence in this matter, for the purpose of showing that, owing to the absence of an important witness, there had been a surprise in the court below. The learned counsel stated the nature of the evidence, and asked that the case might be remitted to the Commissioner for rehearing.

Mr. Giffard opposed the application.

Lord Justice KNIGHT BRUCE was of opinion that there had been no surprise, and refused the application.

Lord Justice TURNER concurred. He was not inclined to fritter away any of the provisions of the new Act of Parliament.

The Court ought to be very careful with regard to the admission of new evidence. No greater mischief existed in bankruptcy under the old system than that which permitted the introduction of fresh evidence on appeal, and which often entirely altered the whole nature and character of the case on which the decision of the Commissioner had been pronounced.

**March 1.**—*Ex parte Johnstone, In re Newton.*—The facts of this case have been already stated. See *ante* pp. 291 and 304.

Mr. Sargood now applied, on behalf of Mr. Johnstone, that the order of discharge made by the Commissioner might be discharged, alleging that there had been a clear case of surprise.

Mr. Newton, who appeared in person, opposed the motion, stating that all the proceedings had been strictly regular, as far as he was concerned, and that he ought not to be put to the expense of applying a second time to the Commissioner for a discharge.

Lord Justice KNIGHT BRUCE said, whether by the fault of any officer connected with the court in Basinghall-street, or by mere accident, it certainly appeared that by no fault of his own Mr. Mallam, the solicitor of Mr. Johnstone, was misled. He was induced to believe, and did believe, that the case would not come on the 27th of January. The order of discharge must therefore be cancelled, with liberty to the bankrupt to apply to the Commissioner for another order.

Lord Justice TURNER concurred.

**THE METROPOLITAN DEBTORS' PRISON.**—On Saturday last the gaolers made their monthly return. There were only ten sheriffs' in Horsemonger-lane, and a small number in White-street and the Queen's Bench.

#### ASSIZE INTELLIGENCE.

##### HOME CIRCUIT.

###### HERTFORD.

**March 4.**—The commission was opened in this city to-day by Mr. Justice Erle and Mr. Justice Wightman. There were only eight causes entered for trial.

##### MIDLAND CIRCUIT.

###### NORTHAMPTON.

**March 1.**—Mr. Justice Williams opened the commission in this town to-day. There were several causes entered for trial.

###### LEICESTER.

**March 5.**—Mr. Justice Williams opened the commission in this town to-day. The cause list had not been issued, being left open for further entries.

##### NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

###### DURHAM.

**March 1.**—Mr. Justice Willes and Mr. Justice Mellor opened the commission in this city to-day. Twenty-two causes were entered for trial, of which six were marked for special juries.

#### LORD MAYOR'S COURT.

(Before the COMMON SERJEANT and a Jury.)

**March 1.**—*Harvey v. the Electric and International Telegraph Company.*—The plaintiff, a solicitor, brought this action to recover damages for the non-transmission of a message by electric telegraph.

The plaintiff's case was that about seven o'clock in the evening he went to the defendants' station in Fleet-street, and sent a message to his brother at Chatham. The clerk who was in attendance undertook to forward it, and said it would be delivered in the course of an hour. The message was not delivered until the following morning, and he unnecessarily had to go down to Rochester in consequence of not receiving a reply. When he did arrive he was too late to transact his business.

The defence was that the message was duly forwarded by telegraph from Fleet-street to the head station of the company in Lothbury, and that the message was sent to the office of the Magnetic Telegraph Company in Threadneedle-street to be transmitted. The usual blank form provided that the company are in no case to be held responsible for the transmission or delivery of the message beyond the terminal station in such request mentioned. There was no breach of contract

on the part of the company, as their terminal station was Lothbury.

The learned JUDGE, after some discussion, said the form of declaration was not sufficient, and the plaintiff would be nonsuited. An appeal would be allowed.

#### POLICE COURT.—DERBY.

Mr. Joseph Shaw, a solicitor in Derby, and late high bailiff of the County Court there, was on Saturday, the 22nd ult., committed for trial on charges of obtaining from Mr. Adsetts, of Duffield, near Derby, £850 by means of a forged deed; from the Prudence Lodge of Druids, £100 by means of a forged deed and two forged promissory notes; and from Mr. Butterson, £600 on a forged deed similar to that given to Mr. Adsetts. On Saturday last two additional charges were preferred against the accused.

It appeared from the statement of Mr. Flewker, the solicitor for the prosecution, that in June, 1860, Mr. Joseph Abell, a farmer, living at Denby, near Derby, applied to Shaw for the loan of £200 upon mortgage of some land, and left the deeds in his possession. Shaw promised to get the money, and the necessary deed was prepared, but it was not until November in the same year that the £200 was forthcoming. From July to November it appears that Shaw had been actively engaged in making copies of the deed, by means of which he succeeded in obtaining the sum of £335 from Mr. Wright, solicitor, Birmingham; £225 from Messrs. Price and Payne, of the Derby Loan Society; and £420 from Mr. Butterson, solicitor, Ecclestone.

Mr. Abell was called, and he proved that the deeds (with the exception of one) were forgeries, and the name of Joseph Hunt, who was represented as the attesting witness, was also proved to be a forgery. The prisoner was committed for trial upon this charge.

Mr. Huish then preferred a fifth charge against him for obtaining, by means of a forged deed, £300 from the British Equitable Investment Society, London. The prisoner was also committed on this charge.

It is stated that in addition to the above charges the prisoner applied to and received from the Druids' Lodge £200 on a forged deed, and the same week obtained £220 from the loan society upon a copy of the same document.

#### Parliament and Legislation.

##### HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, February, 28.

##### LAW OF PROPERTY AMENDMENT BILL.

The House went into committee on this bill.

Clause 1 was to abolish constructive notice except where the Court was of opinion there was fraud.\*

Lord CRANWORTH opposed the clause, stating that it had been sent down to the House of Commons four times and there rejected, and unless there was some more substantial reason, he did not think that their lordships ought to pass it again. For himself he entirely objected to constructive notice in certain cases.

The LORD CHANCELLOR and Lord CHELMSFORD agreed with the noble and learned lord who had preceded them.

Lord ST. LEONARDS stated that his object was to secure the honest purchaser, so that he should not suffer from accidental circumstances, and he had no objection to frame the clause in any way which could secure that end. He wished the notices of charges on property should be direct, and such as no honest man could complain of.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said although there might be evil consequences resulting from the doctrine of implied or constructive notice, still he could not consent to have that doctrine torn up by its roots; and his complaint was that this bill failed to define how far it should be allowed to exist. He was sure that his noble and learned friend was capable of laying down the rule upon this matter, and he therefore hoped that he would withdraw the clause with the view of framing one which would express his intentions more fully and distinctly.

Lord ST. LEONARDS, in accordance with this suggestion, withdrew the clause.

The bill then passed through committee, and their lordships adjourned.

\* See Article on a similar clause in Lord St. Leonards' Bill of last year, 5 Sol. Jo. 351.



Monday, March 3.

#### DECLARATION OF TITLE BILL.

LORD CRANWORTH rose to move the second reading of this bill. After referring to the various measures which had from time to time been brought forward for simplifying the transfer of land, his lordship stated that by the present bill he proposed that where a person had already obtained a declaration of title whenever there was any dealing with the estate any person taking an interest under it should simply put a notice on the back of the deed of the person from whom he takes the interest; thus there would be a record of every transaction, and the deed would form a register itself. There was another advantage worthy of notice. In the second part of his bill he proposed that the measure should operate from the 1st of January, 1863. This would operate in favour of every owner of land; whether he sent for a declaration of title or not he would remain as he was; but there would also be an indorsement on the back of his deed showing the dealing with his property for all time to come. These were his views on this subject.

LORD CHELMSFORD said that what he proposed by his bill was that there should be a slight entry upon the registry of one or two particulars of the instrument, whilst his noble and learned friend proposed a registration of the assurance itself. Now as to the machinery by which a declaration of title was to be obtained, he by his bill, proposed that there should be a Landed Estates Court, consisting of eminent conveyancers, whilst his noble and learned friend (Lord Cranworth) thought it infinitely better that the question raised should be decided by the Court of Chancery.

LORD KINGSDOWN was of opinion that the system of registration, whatever might be its merits, would not remedy complication, and would not prevent expense, though it might remedy the suppression of various instruments. He thought that the system of registration would produce greater evils than it would remove. Whatever might be the change that was to be effected the great object which should be constantly kept in view should be to satisfy the public. He should hesitate before assenting to the appointment of any new officers, especially when he considered the numerous appointments that had been made in former years of gentlemen who had, a few years afterwards, been pensioned or superannuated. It would be vain to attempt to assimilate the simplification of the transfer of land to that of stock; because in the case of land the difficulty was to ascertain the identity of the property.

The bill was then read a second time; as were the following:—Security of Purchasers Bill; Transfer of Land Bill; Title to Landed Estates Bill; Registry of Landed Estates Bill; and Real Property (Title of Purchasers) Bills. All of these bills were then ordered to be referred to a select committee.

The Transfer of Landed Estates Bill was postponed.

Tuesday, March 4.

#### LAW OF PROPERTY AMENDMENT BILL.

This bill was read a second time.

Thursday, March 6.

#### LAW OF PROPERTY AMENDMENT BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

The select committee upon the law bills introduced for the declaration of title, &c., was nominated on the motion of the Lord Chancellor.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, March 3.

#### INNS OF COURT.

SIR G. BOWYER gave notice that on the 11th instant he would ask leave to bring in a bill for the better government of the Inns of Court.

Thursday, March 6.

#### COPYRIGHT (WORKS OF ART) BILL.

This bill was read a second time.

#### Pending Measures of Legislation.

##### LAW OF PROPERTY AMENDMENT BILL.

(As Amended in Committee.)

1. No purchaser for value or mortgagee to be affected by implied or constructive notice unless the Court before which the question is raised shall be of opinion that the conduct of such purchaser or mortgagee amounted to fraud, or unless the

circumstances of the case are such as to satisfy the Court not only that he might have acquired, but that he ought to have acquired, the knowledge with which it is sought to affect him.

2. Saving for sequestrations under 17 Geo. 3. c. 53; 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, &c.

3. Sect. 8 of 2 & 3 Will. 4. c. 71, amended, the word "ease-ment" inserted in lieu of the word "convenient," and sect. 4 of 23 & 24 Vict. c. 38, amended, the word "ancestors" inserted in lieu of the word "executors."

4. Judgments registered in Common Pleas to operate in localities where registries of assurance are established. Not to extend to courts in Lancaster and Cornwall.

5. 23 & 24 Vict. c. 38, amended as to registry of writ of execution, &c., to bind purchaser or mortgagee; entry in future to be in the name of person against whom writ issued.

6. *Lis pendens* to be entered in a separate register.

7. Sect. 213 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 134, amended as to registration of orders for costs.

#### LUNACY REGULATION BILL.

(Brought in by the Lord Chancellor.)

##### Interpretation.

2. Act to be construed as part of Lunacy Regulation Act, 1853, 16 & 17 Vict. c. 70, except where repugnant thereto.

3. No evidence of state of mind for a period more than two years previously to the issue of commission shall be receivable. Opinion or conclusion of medical practitioner not receivable unless judge or master executing commission shall otherwise direct.

4. Form of commission of lunacy.

5. Inquisition whereby person found incompetent to manage his affairs from unsoundness or imbecility of mind to have same force as inquisition finding person lunatic.

6. Commissions of lunacy which are to be tried with a jury to be executed by one of the judges of the superior courts of law.

7. Alleged lunatic to be examined before evidence taken, and at the close of the proceedings before jury consult as to their verdict, unless judge otherwise direct. Examination to be in open court, or in private; if in private, lunatic entitled to be examined in public.

8. Shorthand writer to be appointed.

9. No traverse of an inquisition made by one of the judges of the superior courts and by a jury to be granted, but new trial may be ordered by the Lord Chancellor.

*As to property of insane persons when of small amount.*

10. Power to Lord Chancellor, where lunatic does not oppose application, and his property does not exceed £1,000 in value, or £50 per annum, to apply it for his benefit in a summary manner, without inquisition.

11. Power to sell land or other property of lunatic for his benefit.

12. Power to make general orders, to carry into effect the objects of the last preceding section.

13. Power to apply property of persons who have, on trial of any indictment, been acquitted on the ground of insanity, for their benefit.

##### Charging orders.

14. Lord Chancellor may direct any estate or interest of lunatic in land or stock to be charged with any moneys advanced or to be advanced for his maintenance, debts, and for costs, subject to prior charges thereon.

##### General.

15. All deeds, transfers, payments, &c. made in pursuance of Act to be valid and binding. Indemnity to the Bank of England, &c.

16. Masters may summon witnesses.

##### Visiting.

17. Duties of visitors.

18. All lunatics to be visited twice a year.

19. Visitors also to visit alleged lunatics.

20. Sections 104 and 105 of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 70, repealed.

##### Officers in lunacy.

21. Power to the Lord Chancellor to allow pensions to present visitors, if desirous of retiring.

22. Visitors to hold office during good behaviour, and not to practise in their professions. Increase of their salaries.

23. Clerks to visitors may be appointed by Lord Chancellor. So much of section 23 of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 70, as refers to the clerk of the secretary to the visitors repealed.

24. Lord Chancellor may order pensions to officers in lunacy who have been such for twenty years, when disabled by infirmity.

25. Payment of pensions and salaries.

26. Registrar to hold office during good behaviour.

#### Orders.

27. Office copies of orders to be acted upon by Accountant-General and others.  
Schedule.

#### CHANCERY REGULATION BILL.

(Brought in by Mr. Rolt.)

1. Courts of Chancery and Counties Palatine shall determine every question of law and fact incident to the relief sought thereon.

2. Where expense will be thereby saved, issues of fact may be tried at the assizes.

3. Provisions of Chancery Amendment Act, 1858, as to the trial of questions of fact, to apply to this Act.

4. The High Court of Chancery may sit with assistance of common law judge.

5. Act to commence and take effect from and after the 1st day of November, 1862.

#### PROSECUTIONS EXPENSES BILLS.

(Brought in by Sir G. Grey.)

1. Where such costs, charges, and expenses as are mentioned or referred to in the 5th section of the 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55, are chargeable upon the county rate, and where such costs, charges, and expenses are chargeable on the rates leviable within any borough or place which does not contribute to the county rate, the council or other governing body thereof (including under that term, where there is no other governing body, the justices of the peace having jurisdiction therein), may submit to one of her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State such scale of payments differing from that established by the Regulations of the Secretary of State in respect of such costs, charges and expenses as aforesaid as they may think fit; and such altered scale, if approved by the said Secretary, shall be as valid as if it had been made by him in pursuance of the said Act, subject to this proviso, that no larger payment shall be made out of monies to be provided by Parliament for the purpose of reimbursing any such local rate as aforesaid for payments made in respect of such altered scale than would have been payable if the scale for the time being established by the said Secretary of State had been in force.

#### COPYRIGHT (WORKS OF ART) BILL.

(Brought in by the Solicitor-General.)

1. The author of every painting, drawing, and photograph which shall be made, or for the first time sold or disposed of, either in the British dominions or elsewhere, after the commencement of this Act, and his assigns, shall have copyright in such works for his life and seven years after his death.

2. Copyright not to prevent the representation of the same subjects in other works.

3. Copyright to be deemed personal estate and be assignable at law, and every assignment of and licence to use or copy same shall be made in writing.

4. Penalties on infringement of copyright, £10 for every offence and forfeiture of works.

5. Penalties on fraudulent productions and sales, £10 or double the price of work sold.

6. Mode of recovering pecuniary penalties in England, Ireland, Scotland, and other parts of the British dominions.

7. Importation of pirated works prohibited. Application in such cases of Customs Acts.

8. Right to bring action for damages, in addition to remedies for penalties.

**A YEAR'S BALANCE-SHEET.**—The national income of the year 1861 was raised thus:—Customs and Excise, £41,935,000; taxes, stamps, and Post-office, £25,069,170; miscellaneous, £1,599,681; making a total of £68,603,851. The expenditure takes a fourfold division:—Interest of the debt, £26,090,260; defence of the country, £28,917,342; civil government and charges, £11,112,490; cost of collecting the revenue, £4,697,967; making what we may call a grand total of £70,818,059.

#### Recent Decisions.

##### EQUITY.

##### CHARITY—MORTMAIN.

*Dent v. Allcroft*, M. R., 10 W. R. 184; *Graham v. Paternoster*, M. R., 10 W. R. 209.

The statute 9 Geo. 2, c. 36, generally called the Statute of Mortmain, enacts, that no land or money to be laid out in land shall be given to charitable uses, unless by deed to be enrolled as therein provided. There have been a great number of decisions as to the effect of this enactment upon bequests of money savouring, or of the nature of, or connected with, realty. We are now about to refer to a class of cases included in this general division which, although not within the letter, have been held to be within the policy and spirit, of the statute. Thus, a bequest to a charity is invalid not only where there is an express direction to lay out the money in land, but also where such direction is necessarily implied either from the words of the will or the nature and objects of the charity itself. The object and policy of the Act were to prevent lands from becoming inalienable, or rather to impose embarrassing restrictions upon its alienation; and courts of equity have shown some anxiety and astuteness to extend the provisions of the Act to cases not within its express letter. Thus, it may be stated as a general rule, that a legacy for building a charitable institution is void unless the testator distinctly points to land already in mortmain; and a gift "towards building" to a charity, even where it already possessed land, has been held to be void, because the testator did not preclude the purchase of other land with the money which he had bequeathed. There are a class of cases, however, which at first sight might appear to be inconsistent with what we have mentioned—*ex. gr.* where bequests have been made for *schools* and they have been held good upon the ground that they did not necessarily involve the purchase of land. The most difficult class of cases included under this general head are those in which such a discretion is given to trustees as would enable, but not compel them, to purchase lands. It appears, however, now to be pretty well settled that such a gift is not invalid, as the Court will assume that the trustees will give effect to the bequest in a legal manner; nor is it even certain that the Court will so far interfere with the discretion of the trustees as to insert any declaration in its decree of what would be an illegal application by the trustees of the money, in the exercise of the option which the testator had given them. (See *Tudor's Charitable Trusts*, 79, n. 3.)

In *Dent v. Allcroft* two questions involved in the authorities already referred to were raised—1st, as to a bequest for establishing a school, "or otherwise for school purposes," and 2ndly, as to the discretion which the trustees had under a clause directing them to have regard to the "laws in force."

Sir J. Romilly, M.R., as to the first question, considered that the words "or otherwise," &c., removed all objection to the bequest, the rule being that if by possibility a bequest can be carried into effect without violating the Statute of Mortmain it is good.

As to the second question, his Honour was of opinion that there was, upon the face of the will, an intention on the part of the testator to preclude the application of the bequest or any portion of it in the purchase of land.

The point raised in *Graham v. Paternoster* is analogous to those involved in *Dent v. Allcroft*. A testator gave the residue of his personal estate to trustees to invest "upon real securities," with "power to change the securities or funds," and after the decease of the testator's wife to apply "one-third part of such trust moneys, stocks, funds, and securities" to certain charities. It was long ago decided that a bequest of money secured by a mortgage of real estate, or even by a judgment debt (so far as it affects real estate) is void—in other words, that the statute places any interest in land whereby the land might be acquired upon the same footing as land itself. In the case now under consideration we have seen that the trustees were directed by the will to invest upon real securities. If the will had then stopped there can be no doubt that the gift to charity would have been void. But we have seen that the trustees had power to change the securities or funds from time to time; and the Master of the Rolls, being of opinion that they might invest in other than, or even abstain altogether from investing in, real securities, held that the gift was valid. So far as we are aware, this is a case *prima impressionis*.

It is, no doubt, well settled by numerous authorities that where trustees have a discretion as to the application of a bequest the Court will presume that the discretion will be exercised rather with than without a disregard to the law. It will be found, however, that in all of these cases the discretion related to the object-matter of the bequest; but here the quality of the subject-matter rests in the option of the trustees, and it is possible that the exercise of the option may involve a conflict between the interests of their *cestui que trusts*. The testator evidently leans to an investment upon real securities during the life of his widow—the tenant for life—and such investment might possibly be the most beneficial for her interests. It would appear, therefore, that the trustees may be placed in the dilemma of being compelled to favour one beneficiary at the expense of another; and the strict effect of the decision in this case would seem to be, in fact, to take away the option conferred by the will upon the trustees, and to confine their power of investment to mere personality. We have already said that the Court has no settled practice of declaring by the decree which pronounces the gift to charity to be good that the trustee shall apply it in the manner according to which only the gift would be within the policy of the law. Vice-Chancellor Sir W. P. Wood, in *Cartev. Green*, 3 K. & J. 607, inserted such a declaration for the direction of the trustees; but this is the only case, so far as we know, in which such a declaration has been inserted in a decree. As a rule there is nothing to prevent trustees from doing that which the Court has assumed they would not do. Perhaps, however, where they, having an option to apply a fund legally—*ex. gr.*, the endowment of scholarships, or illegally *ex. gr.* the purchase of land—do the latter, there may be some—though it is not easy to conceive what—mode of enforcing the provisions of the statute. Such a proceeding appears to be in itself improper, as involving an indirect violation of an Act of Parliament. *Ex hypothesi* the trustees could just as easily have had regard to the requirements of the statute without interfering in the least with the duties which they owed to any of their *cestui que trusts*. The Act, moreover, must in such a case generally be violated of set purpose. But in the case now before us, the trustees may in perfect good faith invest in real securities, and the particular estate may determine during such investment, and so the charity become possessed of what the statute says that it cannot take by will—or rather that it can take only by deed enrolled. It must be admitted, however, that the decision of the Master of the Rolls accords with the general current of authority, which for a long time has been very much in favour of the validity of gifts to charity.

#### SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—AGREEMENT TO LEND MONEY.

*Sickel v. Mosenthal*, M. R., 10 W. R. 283.

Sir Hugh Cairns' Chancery Amendment Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict., C. 27), which enables the Court of Chancery to award damages either in addition to or substitution for specific performance, does not enable the Court of Chancery to award damages where it could not decree specific performance, nor is it at all intended to extend the jurisdiction in specific performance to all cases in which damages would be the proper remedy. In *Rogers v. Challis*, 27 Beav. 180, Sir J. Romilly, M.R., observed that it would be productive of very serious evil if, in cases which are the proper subjects of an action for damages, a party could sue in a Court of Equity in the alternative for specific performance or for damages, "thus throwing upon a Court of Equity the functions which properly belong to a jury." In the case just mentioned, therefore, the Master of the Rolls refused either to decree the specific performance of the contract to borrow a sum of money on mortgage, or to award damages for its breach. There are several cases in which the Court refused to make such a decree upon a similar agreement relating to stock. In *Nutbrown v. Thornton*, 10 Ves. 631, Lord Eldon said, "it is now perfectly settled that this Court will not enforce the specific performance of an agreement for the transfer of stock."

In the case now before us Sir John Romilly, M.R., refused to decree specific performance of a contract to lend a sum of money. It was argued that an agreement to lend stood upon a different footing to a contract to borrow money, because the damage sustained by not lending was a continuing damage not ascertainable in an action at law. His Honour, however, was of opinion that the nature of the contract was the same in both cases, and that it was such as could not be enforced in a Court of Equity. (See also *Chinnock v. Sainsbury*, 9 W. R. 7.)

#### COMMON LAW.

##### LAW OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES—SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES—18 & 19 VICT. c. 63, s. 41.

*Ex parte Woolrich*, Q. B., 10 W. R. 250.

There are few subjects connected with our social economy on which the Legislature has bestowed from time to time more careful attention than the regulations of benevolent institutions generally. In reference to friendly societies in particular, the Acts which have passed are very numerous, and there are now existing as many as three by which they are governed, viz., the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 101, and the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 58. One of the matters which has proved to be most difficult of arrangement, is the best method of providing for the cheap and effectual decision of such disputes as may arise between the managers of the society and its members. In certain cases, the rules of the society may now lawfully direct that disputes shall be settled before magistrates; for though the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63 (ss. 40, 41), provided that where such a mode of settlement was directed by the rules of any society then established, disputes should nevertheless be finally and without appeal determined in such cases as in all others, by the county court of the district within which the usual or principal place of business of the society should be situated, yet by a subsequent enactment, viz. 21 & 22 Vict. c. 101, s. 5, the jurisdiction of justices, where pointed out by the rules of any society as the tribunal to be resorted to, was re-established. These, however, are exceptional cases; and in most the county court is the proper tribunal to which to apply "for the removal of any trustee or for any other relief, order or direction, or for the settlement of any dispute that may arise in the society; and the county court has, in relation to such applications, the same jurisdiction (only that it is not subject to any appeal), which, prior to the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, was enjoyed by the Court of Chancery in respect either of its ordinary or of its special or statutory jurisdiction.

It might be imagined that the jurisdiction thus conferred on the district county court was sufficiently ample in its terms to embrace all cases that could arise, and prevent litigation in the superior courts. But such has not proved to be the case—the decisions in the books, more or less closely connected with the construction of this provision in the Friendly Societies Act being singularly numerous. Thus, in *Re Meredith and Whittingham* (1 C. B. N. S. 216), the point was raised by way of an application for a prohibition, whether that section conferred jurisdiction on the county court in the case of a society, which, having been established under a repealed Act, had never duly enrolled its rules under the existing statutes. It was held that the county court had jurisdiction. On the other hand, in *Smith v. Pryse* (7 Ell. & Bl. 339), where the same point of jurisdiction was raised, but where the rules of the society had never been enrolled under any Act previously to the passing of 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, but subsequently had been deposited with the Registrar, though at the time of the application to the county court they had not been certified by that officer, it was held that the condition pointed out by the Act as precedent to the jurisdiction of the county court had not been fulfilled, and the prohibition was granted. So also, it was granted in the case of *Hull v. M'Farlane* (2 C. B. N. S. 796), and the county court restrained from proceeding with an application made by certain trustees of a society in reference to an alteration of the rules proposed to be made by the committee of management of the society. The application was for an order of the Court in the nature of an injunction in equity, restraining the committee from making the proposed alteration; but the Court of Common Pleas held that as the trustees could not by the rules of the society be members, or have any interest in its funds or property except as trustees, they were not parties "interested" in the society by whom alone proceedings in the county court can, by the terms of the 41st section above referred to, be instituted. And there is also another case against the secretary of the same society—*Hoey v. M'Farlane* (4 C. B. N. S. 718), in which the nature of the jurisdiction conferred on the county court by 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, ss. 40, 41, and 42, was carefully discussed; and in which it was among other matters held that such jurisdiction embraced the determination of a dispute between the committee of management and any member with respect to the proper mode of convening meetings of the society for the purpose of altering or amending its rules. We now arrive in due order of time at the present case, which is, we believe, the most recent of those reported on this subject. Here the trustees of a society, duly enrolled and certified under the Acts, had expelled one of the members for an alleged misconduct in applying for



and receiving more money than he was entitled to. His advisers held that this was not a matter intended by the 41st section to be entrusted to the county court—nor was it one for which by the rules of the society any other tribunal had been selected. It was therefore resolved to apply to the Queen's Bench for a mandamus calling on the trustees to reinstate the expelled member, but the Court refused the application, holding the matter to be within the jurisdiction of the county court.

#### NEGOTIABLE SECURITY, RIGHT TO SUE ON—HOW TRANSFERRED.

*Ancona v. Marks*, Exch., 10 W. R. 251.

It is a rule easily defensible on the grounds of public convenience that though, by exception from the general law, the right to sue on a note, bill, or other negotiable security, may be passed by transfer of the instrument, such right does not pass unless under the circumstances and manner of the transfer the transferee obtained an interest in, or at the least, the actual or constructive possession of the instrument. This doctrine was distinctly laid down and acted upon in the case of *Emmett v. Tottenham* (8 Exch. 884). The particular question in that case was, whether, it being admitted that the plaintiff had neither interest in nor actual possession of the bill before the action thereon, he could be held to have had constructive possession by virtue of the interest in and actual possession of the bill by a third party; and this ultimately turned on whether such third party was or was not the plaintiff's agent, which the Court found in the negative. This decision was relied upon by the defendant in the present case. Here the action had been brought by A. B., who had possession of the bill but was not interested therein, in the name of the plaintiff, who had neither interest nor possession before action, but who after action brought had assented to his name being used by A. B., and who had allowed his name to be used by A. B. as a nominal plaintiff on previous and similar occasions. The Court held that under such circumstances A. B. must be considered the agent of the plaintiff, who, therefore, had such constructive possession of the instrument as according to the law recognised in *Emmett v. Tottenham* was sufficient to support the action. Mr. Baron Martin, however, appended to his concurrence in the judgment of the rest of the Court a remark that he should be well content if the law was altered, and nobody but the real owner could sue on it.

It deserves remark that another case on which the defendant in the present case, and also in the case of *Emmett v. Tottenham*, relied upon, viz., the case of *Sainsbury v. Parkinson* (18 L. T. 198), and which we believe does not appear elsewhere, cannot be henceforth used as an authority. The Lord Chief Baron there, it would seem, is represented as having ruled that a plaintiff not interested in a bill cannot, by instructing an attorney to sue thereon, maintain an action as indorsee. But the real effect of that case, it now appears, is that according to the ruling of the Chief Baron, a man who lends his name that an action may be brought on a bill indorsed in blank in which he has no interest, but does not himself employ the attorney for the real owner, and is not liable for costs, cannot bring the action.

### Correspondence.

#### ATTORNEYS' CLERKS BEFORE MAGISTRATES.

With reference to your first leading article in the *Solicitors' Journal* of Saturday last, I beg to call your attention to the fact of the magistrates of the Metropolitan Police Courts permitting persons to attend before them as advocates who are not attorneys, but allege that they are clerks to attorneys. I am sure I need not comment on the general character of such persons, as repeated complaints have been made of their conduct, both as regards their obtaining fees for work which is never performed, and also the mode of performing even that which they do attend to. Is it not this that has made the public generally consider that the class of practitioners in the criminal courts are the scum of the profession, whereas I am sure there are many good men and true whose principal business is in those courts. I would say with Mr. Wharton in his *Articled Clerks' Manual* "that it is not the office that gives dignity to the man who holds it, but that he who holds it may give dignity to the office."

I will not trespass further on your patience, but would suggest that the magistrates should peremptorily refuse to hear all

persons as advocates who are not duly certificated attorneys. It must be clear that the persons who do so attend as advocates at the Criminal Courts, and who are not certificated attorneys, bring themselves within the provisions of the 6 & 7 Vict., c. 73, s. 2, and the 23 & 24 Vict., c. 127, s. 26, and should, in my humble opinion, be proceeded against accordingly.

I shall be glad to know whether or not an attorney on the opposite side might not successfully object to any person but a duly qualified attorney being heard against his client.

J. A. A.

#### PROSECUTORS' EXPENSES.—ATTORNEYS' FEES.

As an Act is about being passed to increase the fees now paid to prosecutors and witnesses, allow me to beg that the fees to attorneys for conducting prosecutions may be increased at the same time, for no respectable attorney will conduct prosecutions for the paltry fees now allowed, as the following case will show.

I was engaged some short time since to prosecute a prisoner for murder at the assizes at Exeter. I had eight witnesses, and the case gave me some considerable trouble in getting up. I prepared two briefs, sixteen sheets each, expecting that I should be allowed to employ two counsel for the prosecution, as I had eight witnesses, but I found that I should be allowed for one only; so one brief was not used. I prepared, and sent by post to the clerk of indictments, instructions for indictment; I travelled sixty miles to the assize town and back, and attended the court four days preparing for the trial, and attending the same; and for the whole of my professional services I was rewarded by the Court with the sum of two guineas only!

What respectable attorney will conduct a prosecution after this?

The witnesses for the prosecution for their four days' service and travelling expenses got a much larger sum than my paltry two guineas.

A COUNTRY ATTORNEY.

#### THE PROPOSED NEW "STUBBS" SOCIETY.

Save us from our friends, at least such professed ones as the *Law Times*—who, like King Stork, proposes to devour the subjects whom he affects to protect. I see from the columns of that periodical of Saturday, the 22nd of February, that it has "constructed with some care" a "definite plan," with which not even Mr. Stubbs could compete, for the collection of debts at fixed charges in the form of a per-centage. Oddly enough, "the society will be registered under the Limited Liability Act," which I thought that journal loudly disapproved of, and called the "Rogues' Charter."

S. MONTAGUE.

13, King-street, Cheap-side, March 1.

### Foreign Tribunals and Jurisprudence.

#### FRANCE.

The Civil Tribunal of the Seine has recently given judgment in a suit brought to recover damages as a compensation for injuries caused by the bite of a parrot. It appeared from the statement of counsel that M<sup>me</sup>. Lefebvre, the plaintiff who resides near Paris, was in her garden in April last, when a parrot belonging to M<sup>me</sup>. Fortin, a neighbour, settled on the ground near her little girl. She attempted to drive the bird away, but it flew at her, and bit one of her fingers so severely that a whitlow followed, complicated with phlebitis. The plaintiff was under medical treatment for eight months, and she now demanded 8000*fr.* damages. On the part of the defendant it was argued that the whitlow was not caused by the bite of the bird, and her counsel produced several medical opinions to that effect. The Court, however, held a different opinion, and condemned M<sup>me</sup>. Fortin to pay 1000*fr.* damages.

#### AMERICA.

Mr. Edwin James made his first appearance on the 11th ult. at the New York Marine Court, on a very trivial assault and battery case, *Alice Behan v. Patrick Riley*. He is described as "a man of about 50 years of age, of pleasing personal appearance, commanding figure, and what the ladies would call good-looking. He has a clear voice and graceful manner. He dresses in the English style, and in addressing the court and jury keeps his left hand under his coat tails—a habit occasioned by the practice of European lawyers, who endeavour to

relieve themselves from the encumbrance of the long silk gown." It was noticed that Mr. James, who was for the defence, frequently made use of the expression "my lud." He told the jury that the plaintiff had no cause of action, although her counsel regretted that the case was not brought into a higher court—the Supreme, the Superior, or the United States' Court—in which she could claim larger damages than in his "Lordship's Court."

#### HAMBURG.

An incident has just taken place at Hamburg showing a tendency to disorder among the inhabitants of that city which was not to be expected in such an important commercial place. The Senate and the Legislative Body had by common accord named a committee of lawyers, charged to draw up a new penal code, in harmony with the progress of civilization. This work completed and published, was submitted to the examination of the legislative authorities. Last week a crowd assembled in the neighbourhood of the city, raised a kind of bonfire, and made an *auto da fé* of the new penal code, amidst the frantic applause of the assemblage.

### The Provinces.

**MANCHESTER.**—The long-discussed question of local politics whether the town clerk of Manchester (Mr. Heron) is fairly entitled to the salary of £2,000 per annum some time ago voted to him by the Corporation, came again before the Town Council on the 4th inst. Mr. Alderman Bennett moved a resolution declaring that £1,500 a year was sufficient remuneration. An amendment was moved by Mr. Alderman Clarke to the effect that, without expressing any opinion on the abstract motion under consideration, the Council felt called upon to declare in the most distinct language, that their recent contract with the town clerk could not be honourably disturbed so long as the duties of the office continued to be discharged by him to the entire satisfaction of the Corporation. After six hours' debate the amendment was carried, by thirty-nine votes against nineteen.

#### Ireland.

Mr. Daniel Coffey, a solicitor, has been appointed taxing-master in the room of Mr. Tandy, deceased.

### Reviews.

*Remarks on the Registration of Title and the Transfer of Land.* By F. N. BUDD, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Bristol Times Office, Bristol, 1862.

Mr. Budd, in the pamphlet before us, offers the following suggestion as a substitute for the Lord-Chancellor's proposed scheme of Land Transfer:—

"Instead of registering every estate and interest, let the register be confined to powers and to potential owners. With the exception of the beneficial owner in fee, who would be placed upon the register simply because his estate carries with it the fullest powers of disposition, no person should be noticed unless he had a power of sale; and wherever a power of sale was created, the names of the persons to whom it was given, together with a short statement of the terms of the power, should be recorded; and, so far as concerned a purchaser, the recorded statement should be made sufficient and conclusive, and all that he need concern himself with. Of course, if the author of the power had imposed the necessity of any consent or formality upon its exercise, the purchaser would have to see that such consent was given or such formality duly attended to; but as the register would give full information as to the person whose consent was required, and as to the nature of the formalities with which the exercise of the power was fettered, there would be no difficulty in attending to these points; and the moment the power was exercised the purchaser's estate would become indefeasible, and the title would start from a fresh root. It may be objected that when a person had purchased from the donee of a power, a purchaser from him would have to look back and see that the power had been

duly exercised; but this need not, and should not, be the case, because the purchaser under a power, as soon as he had satisfied the registrar of his title, which, of course, he would have to do, would be registered as beneficial owner in fee, and such registration should be a perfect protection to a future purchaser."

*Observations on the Present State of the Law affecting Title to Land and its Transfer.* By J. B. PHEAR, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens, Sons, & Haynes.

This is the best account for non-professional readers that we have seen of the difficulties inherent in Land Transfer, and of those attendant upon the present system of conveyancing. Mr. Phear states the case in a manner that makes the questions raised by the Bills before the House of Lords intelligible to the general public; but he does not point out any remedy which he means to be preferable to those measures. Such, however, does not appear to be the object of his pamphlet, which nevertheless will be very useful on account of its well-informed criticism upon Lord Westbury's proposal.

*Defence of the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D. in the Archdeacon Court of Canterbury.* By J. F. STEPHEN, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Smith, Elder, & Co.

This book contains an abstract of the articles recently exhibited against Dr. Williams; extracts from Dr. Williams's contribution to the "Essays and Reviews;" an abstract of counsel's argument; and a full report of Mr. Stephen's speech. As judgment has not yet been delivered in the case, we abstain at present from doing more than announcing this publication.

*The Factory Acts; including the Bleach and Dye Works Act, the Lace Factories Act, and the Print Works Act; with Explanatory Notes, embracing all the Cases decided upon the above Acts. With two Appendices, containing a Summary of the Powers of Inspectors, an Abstract of Penalties for the various offences under these Acts, &c. Together with all the requisite Forms, and a full Analytical Index.* By HENRY CARNE OATS, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens, Sons, & Haynes, 1862.

It is becoming more and more the fashion every day to group Acts of Parliament relating to some special subject matter, or interesting to some particular class of persons, and to publish them with notes in separate works. Few persons out of the factory districts would imagine that there were a sufficient number of statutes about factories to make it worth while collating and editing them; but whoever looks into Mr. Oats' book will not be of this opinion. It contains the following Acts of Parliament, to which are appended useful editorial notes:—

The Factory Health and Morals Act, 42 Geo. 3, c. 73;  
The Factory Act, 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 103;  
The Factory Amendment Act, 4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 1;  
The Factory Regulation Act, 7 & 8 Vict. c. 15;  
The Ropeworks Exemption Act, 9 & 10 Vict. c. 40;  
The Factory Labour Limitation Act, 10 & 11 Vict. c. 29;  
The Factory Labour Amendment Act, 13 & 14 Vict. c. 54;  
The Children's Labour Act, 16 & 17 Vict. c. 104;  
The Factory Act, 1856, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 38;  
The Bleach & Dye Works Act, 23 & 24 Vict. c. 78;  
The Lace Factories Act, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 117;  
The Printworks Act, 8 & 9 Vict. c. 29;  
The Printworks Amendment Act, 10 & 11 Vict. c. 70.

These are all the special statutes now in force for regulating labour in factories, print works, and bleach and dye works.

It will thus be seen that there is a sufficient body of statute law relating to this *specialité* to make it desirable that the several Acts should be placed together and treated as a whole. The number of decided cases relating to these Acts is not very large, but not fewer than sixty have been reported, and all these Mr. Oats has carefully noted.

#### LAW AMENDMENT SOCIETY.

At a meeting of the Law Amendment Society, on Monday last, Mr. W. T. S. Daniel, Q.C., in the chair, Mr. Edward Webster and Mr. J. Napier Higgins read papers on the various measures relating to the Transfer of Land now before Parliament. These papers gave rise to a lively discussion, in which Mr. Freeland, M.P., Mr. Hastings, Mr. Cookson, and Mr. M. H. Cookson, took part.

The CHAIRMAN, after suggesting that as probably a general discussion upon the merits of the several measures would be desired by the society, such discussions would be more conveniently taken at a future time—observed that there might be some danger in incurring the matter with too many legislative provisions. He urged that the two principal objects to be obtained were:—1st, simplifying transfer and conveyance; 2nd, dispensing with investigation into past title. The first object would, to a great extent, be attained, by making all the common and ordinary covenants and provisions incident to the transaction—thus, in a sale, making covenants for title incident to the conveyance; in a mortgage, making the covenant for payment, the proviso for redemption and power of sale incident to the security—in other words, giving the mortgagee in that character a right to sue for the money, a right to foreclose the estate in satisfaction of the debt, or at his option a right to sell after notice, with a further right to receive the rents and profits, either by himself or a receiver. Again in like manner, in cases of marriage settlements, making the power of distress, and entry, and perception of rents and profits incident to a jointure rent charge. Also the trusts for raising portions for younger children incident to the charge of the portions. Also the various powers of leasing for agricultural, mining, and building purposes, incident to estates for life.

The second object would be to a great extent promoted by doing away with all general liens, and admitting no estate or interest in any person, whether judgment creditor, heir-at-law, devisee, assignee in bankruptcy or insolvency, and claiming by any other general title, until the specific right has been made effectual against specific lands; and further, by establishing a uniform and shorter period of limitation than now exists. These two measures, accompanied by the establishment of a simple and easily accessible registry, showing upon all future transactions, the title as founded, would lay the foundation of a system by which the two chief evils complained of would, for the future, be prevented, so that in the course of a few years a simple and indefeasible title would be shown by the register without any investigation into past transactions, and in the meantime the past title might be dealt with as now by special contract. The chairman observed upon the greater importance of establishing a register for the future, than for clearing the title for the past; and however convenient it might be in some cases to clear the title as to the past, those cases would probably be few and exceptional, and hardly sufficient to justify the erection of a special tribunal for the purpose. Ample means might be provided by the Court Chancery. The Chairman also observed that he considered there was some confusion or misapprehension as to the use now proposed to be made of maps. They should merely be used as evidence of boundary, or parcels, and these questions might properly be kept distinct from title. He also observed that the Lord Chancellor appeared to have struck out what might be considered by some a ground of objection in some influential quarters to the proposed extensive changes, namely, the question of professional remunerations, by adopting the system (prevalent in Scotland, and found there to work satisfactorily) of an *ad valorem* per-centage upon the transaction.

#### NOTICE OF SEWALL, C.J. OF THE SUPREME COURT, MASSACHUSETTS.

We extract the following from a recent number of the *Monthly Law Reporter*, published in Boston:—

Samuel Sewall, the third Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts of the name of Sewall, was of honourable descent. His earliest ancestor in this country was Henry Sewall of Newbury, Massachusetts, who was the only son of Henry Sewall of Coventry, Warwickshire, England, and grandson of Henry Sewall, mayor of that city in 1606. He emigrated to New England in 1634; was among the first settlers of Newbury, in 1635; married Jane, daughter of Stephen and Alice Dummer, of that town, March 25, 1646, and went back to England the following winter, with his wife and her father and mother. Thence, after a residence of several years at various places in the counties of Warwick and Hampshire, he returned to Newbury in 1659, bearing a letter (dated March 23, 1658, i. e. 1658-59), of high commendation, to the Governor and Assistants of Massachusetts Colony, from Richard Cromwell the Protector, as being minister of North Baddeley in the county of Hampshire, and personally known to him as "laborious and industrious in the work of the ministry, and very exemplary for his holy life and good conversation." He represented New-

bury in the General Court in 1661, '62, '63, '66, '68, '70; and died in that town May 16, 1700, aged eighty-six. His wife, Jane, died January 13th following, aged seventy-four, and a grave-stone erected to their memory in the grave-yard of Newbury continues to this day.

From this worthy couple, Henry and Jane Sewall, have sprung four judges (three of them chief justices) of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts—namely, Samuel, who graduated at Harvard College in 1671; Stephen, in 1721; David, in 1755, and Samuel, in 1776. To these may be added (as being of the same family connection), Jonathan Sewall (Sewell), Harvard College, 1748, Attorney-General of Massachusetts at the commencement of the revolution, and afterwards Judge of Admiralty for the province of New Brunswick, and his sons, Jonathan Sewall, Chief Justice, and Stephen Sewall, Solicitor-General, of the Province of Lower Canada. And, moreover, it deserves remark, that during the one hundred and twenty-two years which elapsed from the erection of the Supreme Court of this State, in 1692, under the Province Charter, to the death of the subject of this notice, there were eighty-three years, above two-thirds of the whole period, in which a seat on the bench of that court was occupied by one or another of the first four above-named descendants of Henry Sewall, the venerable patriarch of Newbury.

The great-grandfather of the subject of this notice was Samuel, eldest son of Henry Sewall of Newbury, who was born March 28, 1652, at Bishop Stoke, in Hampshire, England, during the temporary residence of his parents in the mother country. He was brought to New England at nine years of age, 1661; fitted for college by Rev. Thomas Parker of Newbury; graduated at Harvard College, 1671; chosen a judge of the Supreme Court of this then province at its erection, 1692; appointed Chief Justice 1718, as successor of Chief Justice Winthrop; resigned 1728, and died honoured and lamented by all, January 1, 1729—30, aged seventy-eight.

His grandfather was the Rev. Joseph Sewall, D.D., of Boston. He was son of the above-named Samuel Sewall and Hannah (Hull) Sewall, his wife; was born at Boston, August 15, 1688; graduated at Harvard College, 1707; was ordained as colleague pastor with Rev. Ebenezer Pemberton, over the Old South Church, Boston, September 16, 1713; and, after a long, faithful, and very successful ministry of almost fifty-six years, departed this life June 27, 1769, aged eighty-one, universally revered and recognised as the "Good Doctor Sewall."

His father was Samuel Sewall of Boston, son of the above-named Rev. Joseph Sewall and Elizabeth (Walley) Sewall, his wife, and was born May 2, 1715; graduated at Harvard College 1733; became a respectable merchant of Boston; was a deacon of the old South Church there, and repeatedly chosen one of the select men of the town. He married, May 18, 1749, Elizabeth Quincy, eldest daughter of Edmund Quincy, Esq., of Braintree and Boston, and of Elizabeth (Wendell) Quincy, his wife, and by her he had eight children, namely, Elizabeth, Joseph (who died in infancy), Hannah, Sarah, Samuel, Dorothy, Katherine, and Joseph.

Samuel, the subject of this notice, was born at Boston, December 11, 1757, in the then ministry house belonging to the Old South Church, a rough plastered two-story dwelling (if rightly recollected), standing in Milk Street, next the Old South Meeting-house and which was then occupied by his father's family, as well as by Rev. Dr. Sewall, his grandfather. At a suitable age he was put, it is believed, to the Boston Latin School, then under the instruction of Master Lovell, senior. But before he had been at this school long, an event occurred which darkened the prospect of his future attainments in knowledge and usefulness. His father had incautiously given his name as surety for another, and was suddenly stripped of his ample possessions by the failure of his friend. So disastrous, apparently, was the effect of this calamity, upon the health and spirits of Mr. Sewall and of his wife, that they both died within a little more than a twelvemonth from its occurrence, leaving a family of seven children. In 1770, Samuel entered the Dummer Academy, in Byfield, then under the care of Master Samuel Moody, to prepare for college.

The biographer, after adverting to the character of Mr. Sewall as a student at college and a young legal practitioner, states that in 1796 and 1798 he was elected a member of Congress, and in 1800 as a judge of the Supreme Court, Massachusetts, in the place of the Hon. Nathan Cushing, who had resigned; and that the same year he was chosen an elector of President and Vice-President of the United States. Upon



the death of Theophilus Parsons, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, on the 30th of October, 1813, Mr. Sewall was appointed to that office, an office which he held for many years, and discharged his duties in a manner which commanded the universal respect and admiration of his professional brethren.

### Public Companies.

#### BILLS IN PARLIAMENT

##### FOR THE FORMATION OF NEW LINES OF RAILWAY IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

The standing orders have been dispensed with in the following cases:—

BRISTOL AND EXETER.  
CHARD AND TAUNTON.  
LLANIDLOES AND NEWTOWN.  
OSWESTRY AND NEWTOWN.

The following bills have been permitted to proceed:—

COWBRIDGE.  
DUDLEY AND BRIDGNORTH.  
HATFIELD AND ST. ALBANS.  
HULL AND WEST RIDING JUNCTION.  
TENDING HUNDRED.

The following bills have been referred to committees:—

ANDOVER AND GREAT WESTERN.  
ANDOVER AND REDBRIDGE.  
BISHOP'S WALTHAM, BOTLEY, AND BURSLEDON.  
BRADFORD AND LEEDS.  
BRISTOL AND CLIFTON.  
BRISTOL AND EXETER.  
BRISTOL AND SOUTH WALES UNION.  
BRISTOL AND SOUTH WESTERN JUNCTION.  
CHARD AND TAUNTON.  
DARTMOUTH AND TORBAY.  
DONCASTER, GOOLE, AND HULL.  
EASTERN COUNTIES (new lines).  
EASTERN UNION.  
GARSTON AND LIVERPOOL.  
GREAT WESTERN AND ANDOVER.  
HULL AND DONCASTER.  
HULL AND GRIMSBY.  
HULL AND HORNSEA.  
HULL AND WEST RIDING JUNCTION.  
ISLE OF WIGHT.  
KNIGHTLEY AND NORTH VALLEY.  
KENT COAST.  
LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE.  
LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE DISTRICTS.  
LANCUNESTON AND SOUTH DEVON.  
LEEDS, BRADFORD, AND HALIFAX.  
LONDON AND MIDLAND.  
LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER BILLS.  
LONDON, EDGWARE, AND BUSHEY.  
MID-KENT AND ADDISCOMBE.  
MORETONHAMPTSTEAD AND SOUTH DEVON.  
NEWPORT AND RYDE DIRECT.  
NORTH DEVON.  
NORTH DEVON AND OKEHAMPTON.  
OLDHAM AND ASHTON.  
RADSTOCK AND KEYNSHAM.  
RAMSGATE, SANDWICH, DEAL, AND DOVER.  
SEVENOAKS.  
SHREWSBURY AND WELSHPOOL.  
SOMERSET CENTRAL AND DORSET CENTRAL.  
SOUTH EASTERN (Tonbridge to Dartford).  
WEST RIDING.  
WYMOUTH AND PORTLAND.

#### MEETINGS.

##### EASTERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly general meeting of this company, held on the 27th ult., a dividend at the rate of £3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 22nd ult., the following dividends were declared for the past

half-year:—"That dividend be and hereby is declared for the half-year at the rate of £5 per cent. per annum upon the Perpetual Preference Stock of the company. At the rate of £5 per cent. per annum upon the Five per Cent. Preference Stock of the company, redeemable at a premium of £10 per cent. At the rate of £4 10s. per cent. per annum upon the four-and-a-half per cent. Preference Stock of the company, redeemable at a premium of £10 per cent. At the rate of £5 per cent. per annum upon the five per cent. Preference Stock of the company redeemable at a premium of £5 per cent. At the rate of £7 15s. per cent. per annum on the Original Undivided Stock of the Company, being for the half-year £3 17s. 6d. per cent. At the rate of three per cent. for the half-year on the B Stock of the company, making, with the £3 per cent. paid for the first half of the year, £6 per cent. for the whole year, as guaranteed by the A Stock. At the rate of £4 15s. per cent. for the half-year on the A Stock, being the balance after payment of £3 per cent. to B Stock."

##### BIDEFORD EXTENSION RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 26th ult., a dividend of 3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### CANNOCK MINERAL RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., a dividend at the rate of 3½ per cent. per annum was declared.

##### CHARING CROSS BRIDGE.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 26th ult., a dividend of 9s. per share, being at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### DUNDEE AND PERTH.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., dividends at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum on the preference shares and 1 per cent. on the original stock, were declared for the past half-year.

##### EASTERN UNION RAILWAY.

At the recent half-yearly meeting of this company, dividends at the rate of £5 8s. per cent. per annum on the A stock, and of £3 12s. per cent. per annum on the B stock were declared for the past half-year.

##### FURNESS RAILWAY.

At the recent half-yearly meeting of this company, a dividend of £8 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### GREAT WESTERN AND WESTERN OF IRELAND RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 24th ult., a dividend at the rate of £2 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 21st ult., a dividend at the rate of £3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### LEEDS, BRADFORD, AND HALIFAX JUNCTION RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., a dividend at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 21s ult., a dividend of £2 7s. 6d. per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### LONDON AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 22nd ult., a dividend of £5 10s. per cent. per annum was declared.

##### MID-KENT RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., a dividend at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

##### NEWRY, WARRENPOINT, AND ROSTREVOR.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., dividends at the rate of 6 per cent on the preference shares, and 1 per cent on the ordinary shares, were declared for the past half-year.

##### NORTH AND SOUTH WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 21st

ult., a dividend at the rate of £5½ per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### NORTH STAFFORDSHIRE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 21st ult., a dividend at the rate of £3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 24th ult., a dividend at the rate of £2 10s. per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### NORTH DEVON RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 26th ult., dividends of 16s. per cent. per annum on the A shares, and 32s. per cent. per annum on the B shares were declared for the past half-year.

#### NOTTINGHAM AND GRANTHAM RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 24th ult., a dividend of £2 0s. 6d. per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### SALISBURY AND DEVONIL RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., a dividend at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum was declared.

#### SHREWSBURY AND HEREFORD RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 26th ult., a dividend at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 21st ult., a dividend at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### SOUTH WALES RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 21st ult., a dividend at the rate of £3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### SOUTHAMPTON DOCK COMPANY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 26th ult., a dividend of £1 15s. per cent. was declared for the past half-year.

#### SOUTH YORKSHIRE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 27th ult., a dividend at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum on the ordinary stock was declared for the past half-year.

#### STAINES, WOKINGHAM, AND WOKING.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 28th ult., a dividend at the rate of 5 per cent. on the preference shares was declared.

#### STOCKPORT, DISLEY, AND STALEYBRIDGE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 27th ult., a dividend at the rate of £2 12s. 6d. per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

#### WHITEHAVEN AND FURNES RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company held on the 28th ult. a dividend of 5s. 6d. per share was declared for the past half-year.

#### WHITEHAVEN JUNCTION RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 27th ult., a dividend of 10s. per share was declared for the past half-year.

#### WHITEHAVEN, CLEATOR, AND EGREMONT RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 20th ult., a dividend of £10 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

THE House of Lords, on the 28th inst., issued an order to the effect, that their lordships' honrs: will not receive any petitions for a private bill for railways or other joint-stock companies after Tuesday, March 25 inst., unless such bill shall have been approved by the Court of Chancery; nor any petition for a private bill approved by the Court of Chancery after Thursday, May 15, next. It was also ordered that the house will not receive any report from the judges upon petitions presented for private bills after May 15 next.

## Court Papers.

### Vacation Business at the Common Law Judges' Chambers.

The following regulations for transacting business at these chambers will be strictly observed till further notice.

Acknowledgments of deeds taken at ten o'clock.

Original summonses only to be placed on the file.

Summonses adjourned by the judge will be heard at half-past ten o'clock precisely, according to their numbers on the adjournment file, and those not on that file previous to the numbers of the day being called will be placed at the bottom of the general file.

Summonses of the day will be called, and numbered at a quarter to eleven o'clock, and heard consecutively.

The parties on two summonses only will be allowed in the judge's room at the same time.

Counsel at one o'clock. The names of the causes to be put on the counsel file, and the causes heard according to number.

Affidavits in support of *ex parte* applications for judge's orders (except those to hold to bail) to be left the day before the orders are to be applied for, except under special circumstances; such affidavits to be properly endorsed with the names of the parties and of the attorneys, and also with the nature of the application, and a reference to the statute under which any application is made, the party applying being prepared to produce the same.

All affidavits read or referred to before the judge must be endorsed and filed.

Further time to plead will not be given as a matter of course.

## Law Students' Journal.

### LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY, 1861-62.

MR. THOMAS HENRY HADDAN, on Equity, Monday, March 10.

MR. FREEMAN OLIVER HAYNES, on Conveyancing, Friday, March 14.

HANDEL FESTIVAL.—The sale of reserved seat tickets for the Handel Festival commenced on Monday morning at the Crystal Palace and at Exeter Hall. The result of the sales up to Thursday is estimated at £9,000. The coming festival has thus already met with a financial success far beyond that of either of its precursors. The leading railway companies have issued notices that their excursion rates will begin on the 15th of June, and it is anticipated that the last week in June will see a congregation of foreigners and country visitors in the metropolis far exceeding that of any former period. To avoid disappointment and delay to applicants for tickets from the country, the committee have issued notices requesting that country orders may leave the selection of tickets to the committee, who pledge themselves to the distribution of tickets in the order in which the applications are received.

POPULATION, REVENUE, &c.—Under this title a curious little return, one of what may be called the fancy returns that occasionally make their appearance, has been presented to Parliament on the motion of Mr. Kinnaird. It shows that in the three years 1858—60 the amount of taxation paid by the three kingdoms under the head of Customs, Post-office, and Inland Revenue (omitting income-tax on public funds and public salaries) was as follows:—England £149,524,475, Scotland £22,451,980, Ireland £19,850,936; in all, £191,827,391. Scotland paid considerably more inland revenue than Ireland, and somewhat more customs duties, but in letter-writing numbers count, and the postage paid was greater in Ireland. Then follows a calculation that the relative proportions of M.P.'s to the mean of population and revenue for the three years are these:—England has 15 representatives too many, Ireland 6 too many, but Scotland 21 too few.

THE INCOME OF THE COURT OF CHANCERY.—On Monday last a return was issued, showing that the income of the Sutors' Fee Fund in the year ending November was £188,777. The fees by stamps amounted to no less a sum than £69,219 12s. 6d.

The scenes which have in the course of the last eighteen months taken place at the weekly sittings of the magistrates

of the Colchester division of the county of Essex were at length brought to an end on Saturday last by Mr. William Rawdon Haven, one of the magistrates, being superseded in the commission of the peace. Towards the close of 1860, a memorial was presented to the late Lord Chancellor Campbell, praying him to adopt that course, but he refused to interfere. It was alleged by Mr. Havens, that the charges in the memorial were false and malicious; and he summoned the magistrates who signed it before the borough magistrates upon a charge of conspiracy. The accused were, however, dismissed. Mr. Haven then preferred an indictment against them at the Essex Assize, but the grand jury ignored the bill. The magistrates had previously commenced a criminal prosecution in the Court of Queen's Bench against Mr. Havens, for charging them with the corrupt administration of the law. On the motion for the rule to be made absolute, he withdrew his charges against the magistrates and clerk, and apologised, and the rule was dismissed on his undertaking to pay the costs. The magistrates continued to hold no intercourse with Mr. Havens. A statement of grievances was prepared by six of them, and presented to Lord Braybrooke, the Vice-Lieutenant of the county, who forwarded it to the Lord Chancellor. His Lordship accordingly called upon Mr. Havens for his reply to the allegations made in this second memorial; but the only reply which he made was that the accusations in both the memorials, and also in the clerk's letter, were false, and, he believed, malicious. The Lord Chancellor has now ordered a letter to be addressed to Mr. Havens, in which the writer, referring to the second memorial, says:—"To these full and particular statements you have not thought fit to return any other answer than the assertion that the whole of the statement is false and maliciously false. You thus charge your brother magistrates with having deliberately invented and published a series of falsehoods, with the malicious intent of doing you an injury. The Lord Chancellor cannot give credit to an accusation so incredible, and so entirely unsupported. In his judgment this charge is a most serious aggravation of your former offensive conduct. The forbearance shown to you in the proceedings in the Court of Queen's Bench have had no effect. I am further directed by the Lord Chancellor to say that it is impossible that you should remain in the same commission with the gentlemen whom you thus accused; and as the Lord Chancellor is satisfied of the correctness of the representations made to him, he feels it to be his duty to direct that your name be struck out of the commission of the peace."

A short time since the benches of Gray's-inn Hall were crowded by such an assembly as never before met under the roof of that learned society. On the dais, instead of the full-wigged benchers, were assembled a large number of ladies and gentlemen well known on account of their philanthropy, and yet in perfect harmony with local associations. They were presided over by one judge and addressed by another, for Mr. Bodkin occupied the chair, and his deputy, Mr. Joseph Payne, exerted himself in his usual felicitous manner to keep this extraordinary meeting in good humour. On the seats in the body of the hall were usually sat the members of the "Utter Bar" and "masses" of the students, sat the parents and other relatives of the children educated in the Fox-court Ragged Schools. Each had before him or her, as the case might be, a plate, a knife and fork, and a mug, and with these little adjuncts of comfort they contrived to fully enjoy a collation followed by tea or coffee, provided for them by the liberality of the supporters of the institution, which trains up their children in the habits of honesty and in the fear of God, thereby checking the growth of juvenile crime in the metropolis, and enabling them, as they were pleasantly reminded, to spend a comfortable jolly evening with the two learned judges already named, instead of having, with all bad passions predominating, to meet them after breakfast in the Court House on Clerkenwell-green. The whole of the proceedings went off in a most satisfactory manner, and it was apparent that the children and their parents were both benefitted by the institution.

**TELEGRAPH COURTESIES.**—An interesting passage of words took place recently between the Pera telegraph office and the Central Office, Lothbury, London. The whole line through between the two capitals being open, Mr. O'Connor, the director of the office at Constantinople, local office, flashed his salutations through to his compeer at the other end, and received back acknowledgment in one minute. The following conversation then ensued:—"What sort of weather have you on the Bosphorus?" "Fine, with thermometer

marking seven degrees." "Is Odessa still closed with ice?" "Yes, two days ago navigation was again interrupted. What kind of weather have you in London?" "Magnificent." "What o'clock is it with you in Constantinople?" "Four o'clock." "What with you in London?" "Ten minutes past two." "Pray what is your name?" "Carron; yours?" "O'Connor." "Are you an Englishman?" "Yes." "A warm shake of the hand to you." "Thanks, the same to you." "Have you any messages for London?" "Yes, a few." "Pray send them on."

### Births, Marriages and Deaths.

#### BIRTH.

YOUNG—On Feb. 27, at Hastings, the wife of Wm. B. Young, Esq., of a daughter.

#### MARRIAGE.

MANSFIELD—LANGHAM—On Feb. 27, Alfred Mansfield, Esq., of Percy-place, Clapham-road, to Martha, daughter of Samuel Frederick Langham, Esq., of Highbury New Park, and Bartlett's-buildings, Holborn.

#### DEATHS.

GREEN—On March 2, Elizabeth, the wife of H. Green, Esq., Solicitor, Fakenham, Norfolk.

TANNER—On March 4, at Christchurch, Hants, William Tanner, Esq., formerly of Devizes, Wilts, Solicitor, in the 55th year of his age.

WYNNE—On March 2, at 22, Westbourne-square, Marcia Elizabeth, wife of James Wynne, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

### London Gazettes.

#### Professional Partnership Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Mar. 4, 1862.

Bevan, William, James Barry Girling, & John Latham Press, Bristol, Attorneys-at-Law and Solicitors. By mutual consent, so far as relates to James Barry Girling. Feb. 19.

#### Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Feb. 28, 1862.

#### UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

North Wheal Exmouth Mining Company.—The Master of the Rolls will on March 6, at 12, appoint an Official Manager of this Company.

#### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Feb. 28, 1862.

Archer, John Grundy, Astley, Leigh, and of Marsden-sq., Manchester, Merchant. May 15. Sol Attkins, Manchester.

Butler, William, New Inn Farm, near Beckley, Oxon, Farmer. April 1. Sols Nallam, 125, High-st., Oxford.

Cleife, Mary, Hereford, Widow. May 1. Sol Humphrys, Hereford.

Hawker, Dame Lucy Hester, Radnor-place, Paddington, Widow. May 1. Sols Booty & Butt, 1 Raymond-bldgs, Gray's-inn, London.

Littleton, Joseph, Kenilworth, Gent. March 8. Sol Hicks, Kenilworth.

Myers, Laurence, Leadenhall-st., London, and Hanover-terrace, Regent's-park, Merchant. April 10. Sols Spyer & Son, 8, Broad-street-bldgs, London.

Palmer, Caroline, formerly of 10 Cranbury-ter, Southampton, and late of 5 Spencer's Bellevue, Landsdowne-rd, Bath, Spinster. April 14. Sols Lindsay & Mason, 84 Basinghall-st.

Peet, Thomas, Southport, Lancashire, Esq. May 1. Sols Sale, Worthington, Shipman, & Seddon, Manchester.

Pryor, James, formerly of Stopley, Luton, and late of Dunkirks, Hertford, Farmer. May 4. Sol Smith, 298 High Holborn.

Puplett, Ann, Chelmsford, Widow. April 24. Sol Horatio Piggott, Chelmsford.

Smith, William Watson, 21 Wilton-st., Grosvenor-pl, Middlesex, Esq. April 15. Sols Patterson & Longman, 3 Winchester-bldgs, London.

Smith, Stephen, sen., Charlton, Dover, Gent. April 21. Sol Stephen Chalk, Dover.

Wall, William, Grosvenor Lodge, York-rd, Kentish Town, and 2 Great Prescott-st, Middlesex, Wine Merchant. May 25. Sol Fry, 6 Dane's-inn, Strand.

Walker, John, Stoney Stanton, and Sapcote, Leicestershire, Gent. May 28. Sol Fox, Luttrethworth.

Woolcott, Sarah, Bedford-st, Covent-garden, Middlesex, Fringe Manufacturer. March 27. Sols Batt & Son, Dyers' Hall, London.

TUESDAY, March 4, 1862.

Brown, William, formerly of James-st, Lambeth, Engineer, but late of 7 Brixton-rise, Brixton-hill, Surrey, Gent. April 14. Sols Holmer & Robinson, 38 Dowgate-hill, London.

Buckle, Thomas, Bewdley, Worcester, Currier, Wine Merchant, and Farmer. June 1. Sols Bury, Gardner, & Gardner, Bewdley.

Burdett, Charles, Loughborough. April 10. Sols H. & W. H. Toone, Loughborough.

Craik, Richard, Percival-st, Waterloo-rd, Chesham-hill, Manchester, Gent. April 5. Sols Smith & Boyer, Manchester.

Follett, Abednego, 4 Rue de Musée, Brussels, Merchant. March 31. Sols Watkins, Hooper, Baylis, & Baker, 11 Sackville-st, Middlesex.

Hartley, Reverend Richard, Rector of Staveley, Yorkshire. May 1. Sol Markland, Leeds.

Lee, George, formerly of Dewsbury, Yorkshire, but late of Pontefract, Butcher and Innkeeper. April 1. Sols Schofield & Aldroyd, Dewsbury.

Lisle, Sarah, formerly of 7 Gloucester-pl, Walworth, Surrey, and late of 2 Appleton-pl, Westmoreland-rd, Walworth. March 28. Sol Piesse, 1 Norton-pl, Albany-rd, Camberwell.



Merccot, Emma, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury, Spinster. May 1. Sol H. T. & G. Waco, Shrewsbury.  
 Mills, John, Miserden, Gloucestershire, Esq. May 1. Sol Lingwood, Cheltenham.  
 Player, Frances, Saffron Walden, Essex, Widow. April 24. Sols W. and R. D. Thurgood, Saffron Walden.  
 Richards, Edward, Ty-y-y Wern Farm, Llantillo Pertholey, Monmouthshire, Farmer. April 7. Sol Price, Abergavenny.  
 Spiers, Charles, 10 Spital-sq, Middlesex, and Amherst-rd, Hackney, Silk Manufacturer. April 19. Sols Norton, Son, & Elam, 37 Walbrook.  
 Spurr, John, York, Chemist and Druggist. May 25. Sol Wilkinson, York.  
 Taylor, Eleanor Buss, Leverington, Isle of Ely, Spinster. April 5. Sols C. and F. M. Metcalfe, Wisbech.  
 Williams, James William, formerly of 23 Trigon-ter, Clapham-rd, Surrey, and late of Bombay, Accountant. April 15. Sols Simpson, Roberts, & Simpson, 62 Moorgate-st.  
 Wainman, William, Armley, Leeds, and Bishopgate-st, Leeds, Cloth Merchant. May 1. Sol Markland, Leeds.

### Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Feb. 28, 1862.

Fry, William, 37 Great Guildford-st, Southwark, Engineer. March 21.  
 Fry v. Fry, V. C. Stuart.  
 Grenfell, Charles William, Tapton Court, Bucks, also of 5 Grosvenor-ter, Belgrave-sq, Westminster. April 10. Richardson v. Grenfell, V. C. Stuart.  
 Grove, James, College-st, Camberwell Grove, Surrey, Beer-shop-keeper. March 20. Newell v. Grove, V. C. Stuart.  
 Leaton, Thomas, Deeping-gate, Northampton, Farmer and Grazier. April 11. Leaton v. Armstrong, V. C. Kindersley.  
 Peters, Roger, Aberystwyth, Master Mariner. March 29. Peters v. Howlands, V. C. Wood.  
 Shearburn, William, Dorking, Surrey, Builder. March 27. Shearburn v. Shearburn, M. R.  
 Stanton, John, Great Bolton, Lancashire, Agent. March 24. Taylor v. Stanton, M. R.  
 Turner, William Beckett, Penleigh House, Westbury, Wilts. April 15. Sargent v. Beckett, V. C. Stuart.

TUESDAY, March 4, 1862.

Badger, Isaac, Dudley, Ironmaster. March 20. Fletcher v. Green, V. C. Wood.  
 Hogg, Archibald, 6 Queen-st, Edgware-rd, Middlesex, Gent. March 22. Hogg v. Cook, M. R.  
 Mitchell, John, sen., New Close, Dewsbury, Manufacturer. March 29. Botsomley v. Mitchell, M. R.

### Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

FRIDAY, Feb. 28, 1862.

Bookes, John William, Rose Inn, Lower-st, Deal, Licensed Victualler. Feb. 20. Sol Harris, 34a Moorgate-st.  
 Cropper, Benjamin, Hey Mills, Lees, Ashton-under-Lyne, Cotton Spinner. Feb. 14. Sol Ponsonby, Oldham.  
 Currie, Robert, 11 Hill-st, Knightsbridge, Middlesex, Draper. Sols Surr & Gribble, 12 Abchurch-lane.  
 Hinchliffe, Richard, 7 Grove-st, Oldham, Cotton Spinner. Feb. 13. Sol Ponsonby, Oldham.  
 Lucas, Edward, Rees Barn, Eccleshall, Staffordshire, Farmer. Feb. 3. Sol Robinson, Eccleshall.

TUESDAY, Feb. 24, 1862.

Barratt, John, Peterborough, Grocer. Feb. 14. Sol Rutland, Peterborough.  
 Howe, James, Cowpen Village, Northumberland, Farmer and Builder. Jan. 28. Sol Brewis, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
 Ritchie, Robert, 10 King-st, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper. Feb. 10. Sol Menda, Hull.  
 Sunter, John, Kirkby Stephen, Westmorland, Butter Carrier and Grocer. Feb. 11. Sol Preston, Kirkby Stephen.

### Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Feb. 28, 1862.

Abbott, Edwin Morton, Bow Brewery, Bow, Middlesex, Brewer. Jan. 28. Assignment. Reg Feb 25.  
 Bainbridge, John Davison, South Shields, Tailor. Feb. 4. Conveyance. Reg Feb 25.  
 Bowman, William Henry, Colnbrook, Bucks, Draper. Feb. 30. Assignment. Reg Feb 27.  
 Brewster, Abraham Charles, 54 Edgware-rd, Hyde-park, Middlesex, Coach Builder. Jan. 29. Composition. Reg Feb 26.  
 Catling, James, 108 Fenchurch-st, London, Hemp Merchant. Feb. 5. Assignment. Reg Feb 27.  
 Chester, Walter, Hampstead-row, Handsworth, Birmingham, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Feb. 4. Assignment. Reg Feb 26.  
 Choake, Henry, Modbury, Devonshire, Tanner. Jan. 29. Assignment. Reg Feb 25.  
 Davies, William, Leeds, Smallware Dealer. Feb. 22. Assignment. Reg Feb 27.  
 Dean, John, Ford-st, Old Ford, Middlesex, Builder. Feb. 6. Assignment. Reg Feb 25.  
 Furbank, Alfred, Rotherham, Grocer. Feb. 20. Composition. Reg Feb 24.  
 Gilbert, Ebenezer, Huntingdon, Banker's Clerk, and Eliza Thomazine, his wife. Jan. 27. Assignment. Reg Feb 24.  
 Gilling, Francis, 1 Russell-villas, Twickenham, Middlesex, Photographic Artist. Feb. 19. Composition. Reg Feb 27.  
 Holt, Samuel, 99 Crawford-st, Middlesex, Upholsterer. Feb. 15. Assignment. Reg Feb 27.  
 Jones, Evan, Aberystwyth, Wine Merchant. Jan. 28. Assignment. Reg Feb 25.  
 Lates, William Winter, Uttoxeter, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb. 18. Conveyance. Reg Feb 26.  
 McNamara, Edward Kingell, Pavilion Hotel, North Woolwich, Hotel Keeper. Jan. 31. Composition. Reg Feb 26.  
 Osborne, George Alexander, 2a Well-st, Jewin-st, London, Cap Manufacturer. Jan. 30. Assignment. Reg Feb 25.  
 Palmer, Joseph, Swinford, Leicestershire, Builder. Jan. 30. Assignment. Reg Feb 26.

Pattison, Robert, Chester-le-street, Durham, Miller. Jan. 31. Assignment. Reg Feb 24.  
 Quincey, John Harcourt, 150 Fenchurch-st, London, Birmingham and Sheffield Agent. Feb. 13. Composition. Reg Feb 25.  
 Ryder, Thomas, & Petronius Hodges, Manchester, Manufacturers. Feb. 26. Composition. Reg Feb 27.  
 Salisbury, William, Suffolk-rd, Cheltenham, Builder. Feb. 8. Assignment. Reg Feb 26.  
 Thorneycroft, Edward Bagnall, & Samuel Griffiths, Staffordshire Iron Works, West Bromwich, Iron Masters. Feb. 20. Inspectorship. Reg Feb 25.  
 Turtle, William, jun., & John Turtle, Sheffield, Builders. Jan. 27. Assignment. Reg Feb 24.  
 Turtle, William, jun., & John Turtle, Sheffield, Builders. Feb. 4. Composition. Reg Feb 25.  
 Vickers, John, Buxton, Derby, Builder. Feb. 15. Conveyance. Reg Feb 27.  
 Wakeman, William Thomas, Tonbridge Wells, Tailor. Jan. 30. Composition. Reg Feb 27.  
 Wickes, Alfred Nelson, 3 George-yard, Lombard-st, Parish Clerk. Feb. 26. Composition. Reg Feb 26.  
 Wilson, William, Halifax, Draper. Feb. 2. Assignment. Reg Feb 27.  
 Wyatt, John William, 64 and 65 Bunhill-row, and 154 Old-st, Saint Luke's, Middlesex, Steel Frame Manufacturer. Feb. 21. Reassignment. Reg Feb 29.

TUESDAY, March 4, 1862.

Ball, John William, Eckington, Derbyshire, Saddler. Feb. 12. Conveyance. Reg March 3.  
 Bateman, George, 32 Thornton-st, Brixton-rd, Surrey, Builder. Feb. 17. Assignment. Reg Feb 28.  
 Bishop, Joseph, Liverpool, Spirit Dealer. Feb. 19. Assignment. Reg March 1.  
 Blakeman, John, Stafford, Auctioneer. March 1. Conveyance. Reg March 3.  
 Calvert, Francis William, York, Attorney-at-Law. Feb. 5. Conveyance. Reg March 3.  
 Campbell, Patrick, and Edward Prince, Liverpool, Builders. Feb. 19. Composition. Reg March 1.  
 Chadwick, Joseph, Middleton, Silk Manufacturer. Feb. 27. Composition. Reg March 3.  
 Cook, Thomas, Wainfleet, Lincoln, Innkeeper. Feb. 5. Assignment. Reg Feb 27.  
 Coombes, Samuel, Birmingham, Draper. Feb. 20. Assignment. Reg Feb 28.  
 Cozens, Philo, and Adolphus Cozens, Bilston-st, Wolverhampton, Carriers. Feb. 13. Assignment. Reg March 2.  
 Hyde, Robert Abbott, Greengate, Salford, Soap and Candle Dealer. Feb. 12. Assignment. Reg March 3.  
 Johnson, Thomas, Leek, Staffordshire, Painter. Feb. 1. Composition. Reg March 1.  
 Jones, James, 5 Lowther-arcade, Strand, Jeweller. Feb. 22. Composition. Reg March 3.  
 Kendall, Edward, Saint Enoder, Cornwall, Mason and Innkeeper. Feb. 1. Assignment. Reg Feb 28.  
 Kent, William Andrews, Sheffield, Draper. Feb. 9. Assignment. Reg March 3.  
 Lockyer, Nicholas, 9 Charles-st, St. James's-sq, Middlesex, and of Plymouth, Attorney and Solicitor. March 1. Conveyance. Reg March 3.  
 Roekner, Carl Heinrich, Marsh-st, Bristol, Cement Maker. Feb. 24. Composition. Reg Feb 28.  
 Scott, Robert, Shouldham, Norfolk, Miller. Feb. 11. Conveyance. Reg March 1.  
 Street, James, Eckington, Derbyshire, Earthenware Manufacturer. Feb. 13. Conveyance. Reg March 3.  
 Strongtharm, Edward, Walsall, Staffordshire, Lime Master. Feb. 18. Assignment. Reg March 1.  
 Sunter, John, Kirkby Stephen, Westmoreland, Butter Carrier. Feb. 11. Assignment. Reg March 3.  
 Tayler, Edward, 77 Watling-st, London, Wholesale Manufacturer of Millinery. Feb. 4. Assignment. Reg March 1.  
 Uridge, James, Challey, Sussex, Farmer. Feb. 4. Assignment. Reg March 3.  
 Walker, Joseph, New-st, Worcester, Upholsterer. Feb. 5. Assignment. Reg Feb 28.  
 Watkins, Henry, Birmingham, Jeweller. Feb. 21. Composition. Reg Feb 28.

### Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Feb. 28, 1862.

Amery, Betsey, 2 Notte-st, Plymouth, Widow. Feb. 23. East Stonehouse, March 15 at 11. Sols Edmonds & Sons, 5 Parade, Plymouth.  
 Atkins, William, 1 Richmond-rd, Barnsbury, Middlesex, Cattle Dealer. Feb. 24. London, March 18 at 10. Sol Feverley, 19 Coleman-st.  
 Aylan, Thomas, Stockton-upon-Tees, Ship Broker. Feb. 26. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 12 at 11. Sols Faber & Wilson, Stockton-upon-Tees.  
 Bentley, Henry, 19 Carlton-st, Brighton, Carpenter. Feb. 23. Brighton, March 19 at 11. Sol Goodman, Brighton.  
 Blutley, Richard, Eaves-green, Chorley, Lancashire, Block Cutter. Feb. 11. Chorley, March 6 at 9. Sol Anderton, Chorley.  
 Bowers, Jacob, 1 Sidney-st, York-rd, King's-cross, Middlesex, Potatoe Salesman. Feb. 24. London, March 11 at 11.30. Sols Lewis & Lewis, 10 Ely-pl.  
 Briou, Henry De, 20 Bedford-sq, Middlesex, Professor of Mathematics. Feb. 24. London, March 11 at 2. Sols Lewis & Lewis, 10 Ely-pl.  
 Brust, John, 4 Belle Vue-pl, Blue Anchor-rd, Bournemouth, Baker. Feb. 25. London, March 14 at 12. Sol Hent, 11 Cannon-st West.  
 Burne, John Robinson, 26 Market-st, Manchester, General Agent. Feb. 27. Manchester, March 11 at 12. Sols Foster, Churchill, & Peacock, Manchester.  
 Caperton, William Bethell, 1 Munden-ter, Hammersmith, Olman. Feb. 26. London, March 13 at 12.30. Sol Waller, 2 Duke-st, Adelphi.  
 Catchpole, Caroline, Minories, London, Outfitter. Feb. 23. London, March 17 at 1.30. Sols Ashurst & Co., 6 Old Jewry.  
 Clayton, Isaac, 8 Westgrove-st, Bradford, Fruiturer. Feb. 23. Bradford, March 13 at 10.30. Sol Watson, Bradford.  
 Clask, Samuel, 16 Tyler-st, Regent-st, Middlesex, Watch and Clock Maker. Feb. 24. London, March 14 at 11.30. Sol Cooper, 9 Charing-cross.

Cockayne, John, Ford-st, Derby. Wheelwright. Pet Feb 25. Derby, March 12 at 12. Sol Footitt, Derby.

Collins, John Bright, 65 Wellington-st, Woolwich, Bootmaker. Pet Feb 24. London, March 17 at 11.30. Sol Hughes, 148 High-st, Woolwich.

Cotton, George, 34 Hertford-st, Coventry. Hair Dresser. Pet Feb 26. Coventry, March 18 at 3. Sols Minster & S n, Coventry.

Cronshaw, Thomas, Liverpool, Tailor. Pet Feb 26. Liverpool, March 14 at 1. Sol Eddy, Liverpool.

Dunlop, Joseph, 10 South-st, King's-rd, Chelsea, Middlesex. Licensed Beer House Keeper. Pet Feb 23. London, March 18 at 10. Sol Davies, 9 Union-court, Old Broad-st.

Davis, William, 44 Lower Loveday-st, Birmingham, Wood Turner. Pet Feb 23. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Corles, Birmingham.

Dean, James Francis John, 21 Henrietta-st, Brunswick-sq, Middlesex. Carman. Pet Feb 24. London, March 13 at 11.30. Sol Marshall, 12 Hatton-garden.

Debbage, James, Ingate-rd, Beccles, Suffolk, Cooper. Pet Feb 26. Beccles, March 17 at 10. Sol Kent, Beccles.

Elliott, Robert, 69 Navy-row, New Passage, Devonport, Licensed Victualler, Pet Feb 23. East Stonehouse, March 15 at 11. Sol Gidley, Plymouth.

Fairclough, James, Jun, 3 Charles-st, Gateshead. Pet Feb 22. Gateshead, March 13 at 12. Sol Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Flowerdew, William, Jun, Little Yarmouth, Suffolk, Timber Dealer. Pet Feb 26. Great Yarmouth, March 17 at 12. Sol Cufande, Great Yarmouth.

Franklin, Joseph, Hawthorn-cottages, Hawthorn-grove, Penge, Surrey. Gent. Pet Feb 21. London, March 11 at 1.30. Sols Spyer & Son, 8 Broad-st-buildings, City.

Fletcher, William, Mousehold-hill, Thorpe, Norwich, Millwright. Pet Feb 22. London, March 17 at 12.30. Sols Sote, Turner, & Turnes, 68 Aldermanbury, and Miller, Son, & Bugz, Norwich.

Giabb, William, Michael Church, Eskley, Herefordshire, Farmer. Pet Feb 24. Birmingham, March 17 at 12. Sols Cheese, Kingston, Herefordshire, and Hodgson & Allen, Birmingham.

Gardner, James, Jun, 4 Davis's buildings, Park-st, Coventry-rd, Birmingham, Warehouse Clerk. Pet Feb 26. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Parry, Birmingham.

Giddings, James, Milton, near Fawsey, Wiltshire, Journeyman Mason. Pet Feb 15. Marlborough, March 14 at 2. Sol Cave, Newbury.

Gleaves, William, Abbotsley, Huntingdonshire, Farmer. Pet Feb 25. London, March 17 at 1. Sols J. & C. Cole, 36 Essex-st, Strand, and Wayman, Cambridge.

Goodacre, William, & Thomas Cockayne, 33 Northumberland-st, Strand, Schoolmasters. Pet Feb 26. London, March 14 at 1. Sols Piewa & Boyer, Old Jewry.

Hall, William, Percy Main, near North Shields, Grocer. Pet Feb 24. North Shields, March 12 at 11. Sol Lowrey, North Shields.

Hall, William, Brecon, Draper. Pet Feb 8. Bristol, March 14 at 11. Sols Davidson, Bradbury, & Hardwick, 22 Basinghall-st, and Whittington & Gribble, Bristol.

Hammond, Thomas, sen, Knockholt, near Sevenoaks, Kent, Butcher. Pet Feb 24. London, March 13 at 11.30. Sol Silvester, 18 Great Dover-street.

Hannant, Richard, 12 Wellington-place, Arbour-sq, Stepney, Middlesex, Tailor. Pet Feb 26. London, March 13 at 1. Sol Earle, 29 Bedford-row.

Hankinson, Percy Edward, 52 Seymour-pl, Bryanstone-sq, Middlesex, Eating House Keeper. Pet Feb 26. London, March 13 at 12. Sol Silvester, 18 Great Dover-st.

Harvey, Thomas, 3 St James-st, Hammersmith, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Feb 27. London, March 13 at 1. Sols Lawrence, Piewa, & Boyer, 14 Old Jewry-chambers.

Healey, Peter, Hambleton, Rutland, Farmer. Pet Feb 26. London, March 18 at 10. Sols Wright & Bonner, 15 London-st, Fenchurch-st.

Henbury, William Henry, Water-lane, Winchester, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Feb 24. Winchester, March 11 at 11. Sol Hollie, Winchester.

Hopwood, James, Alma-ter, Burnley-rd, Accrington, Lancashire, Letter Press Printer. Pet Feb 24. Manchester, March 12 at 11. Sols Cobbett & Wheeler, Manchester.

Jackson, Samuel, 22 Fowler-st, Derby, Joiner. Pet Feb 24. Derby, March 12 at 12. Sol Footitt, Derby.

Jenkins, Joseph, George-st, Birmingham, Publican. Pet Feb 24. Birmingham, March 14 at 10. Sols Powell & Son, Birmingham.

Johnson, James, Hockwold cum-Wilton, Norfolk, Carpenter. Pet Feb 25. Thetford, March 11 at 12. Sol Sadd, Norwich.

Joy, William, Tonbridge, Plumber. Pet Feb 24. Tonbridge, March 10 at 11. Sol Arnold, Tonbridge Wells.

Kerkhoff, William, Birmingham, Clothier. Pet Feb 23. Birmingham, March 14 at 11. Sol Webb, Birmingham.

Lee, John, 56 Bedford-st, Birmingham, Wood Turner. Pet Feb 24. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Francis, Birmingham.

Maer, Henry Devreux, Mark-lane, London, and Rue De Hautville, Paris. Pet Feb 19. London, March 14 at 12. Sol Lloyd, Wood-st.

Markham, James, Church-st, Dunstable, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 25. Luton, March 17 at 4. Sol Simpson, St. Alban's.

Mather, Frank Joseph, Dartmouth, Linen Draper. Pet Feb 27. Exeter, March 14 at 11. Sols Smith, Dartmouth, or Flood, Exeter.

McCreery, John, 4 Claremont-walk, Foregate-st, Clacton, Butcher. Pet Feb 24. Chester, March 14 at 2. Sol Cartwright, Chester.

McGachen, Robert, 39 Upper Huskisson-st, Liverpool, Merchant. Pet Feb 24. Liverpool, March 13 at 12. Sol Samuel, Liverpool.

McLaver, Peter, 101, Union-st, East Stonehouse, Draper. Pet Feb 25. Exeter, March 19 at 12.30. Sols Elworthy, Curtis, & Dawe, Plymouth.

Meads, John, Jun, Wellesbourne, Mountford, Warwickshire, Farmer. Pet Feb 23. Birmingham, March 17 at 12. Sols Lane, Stratford-on-Avon, and Hodgson & Allen, Birmingham.

Monington, Sarah, Church-st, Wellington, Salop, Milliner. Pet Feb 21. Wellington, March 13 at 9. Sol Taylor, Wellington.

Moore, Robert, 169 Parrock-st, Gravesend, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Feb 25. Gravesend, March 16 at 12. Sol Catchpole, 28 St. Tower-st, London.

Naylor, William, Cleckheaton, Yorkshire, Tailor. Pet Feb 25. Bradford, March 13 at 10.30. Sols Terry & Watson, Bradford.

Nicholls, William, William the Fourth, King's-rd, Chelsea, Beershop Keeper. Pet Feb 26. London, March 18 at 10. Sol Abbott, 1 St. Mark-st, Great Prescott-st.

Overton, John, Kenilworth, Tailor. Pet Feb 24. Birmingham, March 14 at 11. Sols Poole & Burkitt, Kenilworth, and Hodgson & Allen, Birmingham.

Palmer, James, 35 Stoke-st, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. Pet Feb 26. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Fuller, 63 Wheeler-lane, Birmingham.

Pemberton, Maria, 51 Tithe Barn-st, Preston, Shopkeeper. Pet Feb 25. Preston, March 15 at 10. Sol Blackhurst, Preston.

Pickford, Thomas, 100 High-st, Southwark, Artificial Manure Merchant. Pet Feb 24. London, March 14 at 12. Sol Roberts, 2 Barge-yard-chambers.

Pietz, Frank (and not Frank Piety, as previously advertised).

Pinkney, George, Brilington, Agricultural Implement Maker. Pet Feb 26. Kingston-upon-Hull, March 26 at 12. Sol Pettingell, Hull.

Potter, George, Huckerby, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet Feb 24. Gainsborough March 13 at 11. Sol Bladen, Gainsborough.

Price, Benjamin, 7 Plummer's-row, Whitechapel, Middlesex, Builder. Pet Feb 22. London, March 11 at 12. Sol Dalton, 3 Backlbury.

Pritchard, John, Llandudno, Carnarvonshire, Hotel Keeper. Pet Feb 19. Liverpool, March 13 at 11.30. Sols Reece & Farrant, Llandudno, and Evans, Son, & Sandys, Liverpool.

Pritchard, James, 1 Bishop-pl, Birmingham, Wood Turner. Pet Feb 24. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Francis, Birmingham.

Puntis, Josiah, Southampton, House Decorator. Pet Feb 26. London, March 11 at 12. Sols Paterson & Son, 7 Bouverie-st, Fleet-st, and Mackey, Southampton.

Radford, Sarah, & James Radford, Manchester, Umbrella Manufacturers. Pet Feb 23. Manchester, March 12 at 11. Sol Baker, Manchester.

Robinson, George, Buckton, Yorkshire, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 27. Bridlington, March 22 at 10. Sol Richardson, Bridlington.

Robinson, Sidney William, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Livery Stable Keeper. Pet Feb 24. London, March 11 at 1. Sol Hall 21 Coleman-st.

Sanderson, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. Pet Feb 26. Kingston-upon-Hull, March 19 at 12. Sols Holden & Sons, Hull.

Sanderson, Joseph, Kingston-upon-Hull, Factor. Pet Feb 26. Kingston-upon-Hull, March 19 at 12. Sols Holden & Sons, Hull.

Shotton, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Builder. Pet Feb 24. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 12 at 12. Sol Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Shuttleworth, James Simpson, 7 Abbey-st, New Accrington, Lancashire, Bookseller. Jan 11. Manchester, March 10 at 12.

Sleeman, Richard, 5 James ter, Pimlico, Middlesex. Feb 21. London, March 14 at 11.

Smith, George William, Dickleburgh, Norfolk, Linen Drap'r. Pet Feb 17. Norwich, March 10 at 12. Sol Atkinson, Norwich.

Stoke, James, sen, & William Stoke, Newton, Northumberland, Millwrights. Pet Feb 20. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 12 at 11. Sols Cram & Legge, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Stone, Francis William, 6 Northumberland-st, Strand, Middlesex. Pet Feb 24. London, March 18 at 10. Sol Harcourt, 2 King's Arms-yd.

Swann, William, & Benjamin Swann, Collyhurst-st, Manchester, Woolen Manufacturers. Pet Feb 25. Manchester, March 11 at 11. Sols Crowther & Farrington, Manchester.

Tarver, Charles Thomas, 5 Calvert-st, Shoreditch, Middlesex, Merchant's Clerk. Pet Feb 25. London, March 11 at 2. Sol Peverley, 19 Coleman-st.

Tate, John, Liverpool, Tailor. Feb 19. Liverpool, March 12 at 3. Sol Sandys, Liverpool.

Taylor, Joseph, 30 Weaman-st, Birmingham, Book Keeper. Pet Feb 25. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Duke, Birmingham.

Tristram, Bower, 50 West Derby-st, Liverpool, Leather Factor. Pet Feb 24. Liverpool, March 13 at 3. Sol Groot, Liverpool.

Turner, Thomas, 99 Wardour-st, Soho, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 25. London, March 13 at 12. Sol Peverley, 19 Coleman-st, London.

Vosper, Thomas N cholls, 15 Union-st, Stonehouse, Commercial Traveller. Pet Jan 27 (in forma pauperis). Exeter, March 12 at 11. Sol Flood, Exeter.

Walsley, John, 14 King-st, Bury, Engineer. Pet Feb 26. Bury, March 13 at 11. Sol And-rou, Bury.

Whale, John Edward, New-court, Old Bailey, London, and 4 Park-road, Crouch End, Hornsey, Manufacturer of Fancy Trimmings. Pet Feb 24. London, March 17 at 12. Sol Hope, 9 Ely-place.

Wiley, Christopher, Goringham, Suffolk, Fisherman. Pet Feb 20. Great Yarmouth, March 17 at 12. Sol Cufande, Great Yarmouth.

White, James, 7 Goodge-st, Middlesex, Butcher. Pet Feb 25. London, March 14 at 1. Sol Stophor, Coleman-st.

Whitehead, William, 60 Kent-st, Birmingham, Electro Plater and Gilder. Pet Feb 24. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sols Powell & Son, Birmingham.

Wills, David, 4 Hall-st, Manchester, Clerk. Pet Feb 21. Manchester March 11 at 9.30. Sol Elford, Manchester.

Wilmott, William, Withey, Verdes Farm, Llantrissant, Monmouthshire, Farmer. Feb 14. Usk, March 13 at 11.

Winstone, Evan, Pepper, Corn Hill, Pendre, Brecknock, Licensed Parish Clerk. Pet Feb 24. Brecknock, March 11 at 12. Sol Bishop, Brecknock.

Wisedell, John Edward, 1 William-st, Caledonian-rd, Middlesex. Pet Feb 26. London, March 18 at 10. Sol Waller, 2 Duke-st, Adelphi.

Withers, Edwin, 46 Middlesex-place, Hackney-rd, Middlesex, Bookseller. Pet Feb 24. London, March 11 at 3. Sol Buchanan, 13 Basinghall-st.

Wright, Hannah, Saint Mary's-st, Oldham, Publican. Pet Feb 21. Oldham, March 13 at 12.

Zoller, Joseph, 14 Home-row, Crawford-st, Middlesex, Baker. Pet Feb 26. London, March 13 at 12.30. Sol Leader, 59 New-man-st, Oxford-st.

## TUESDAY, March 4, 1862.

Adams, William, York-place, Whistones, Worcester, Bricklayer. Pet Feb 26. Worcester, March 20 at 11. Sol Wilson, Worcester.

Auker, John, 71 Saint Stephens-st, Norwich, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Feb 28. Norwich, March 17 at 19. Sol Sadd, Jun, Norwich.

Baker, Edmund Dasset, Castle Green, Taunton, Baker. Pet March 1. Williton, March 28 at 11. Sol Taunton: Taunton.

Deall, Richard, 4 Charlotte-row, West Merice Town, Devonport, Rope-maker. Pet Feb 26. Exeter, March 19 at 12.30. Sols Beer & Randle, Devonport, or Hartnoll, Exeter.

Bear, Henry, Nayland, Suffolk, Grocer. Pet Feb 26. London, March 30 at 11. Sols Madox & Wyatt, 30 Clement's-lane, and Cardinall, Halstead, Essex.

- Beesley, George, 2 York-place, Camden-town, Middlesex, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Feb 27. London, March 18 at 11. Sol Naah, Haberdasher-place East, Hoxton.
- Bell, James, and Joel Bell, Manchester, Silk Manufacturer. Pet Feb 26. Manchester, March 15 at 11. Sol Leigh, Manchester.
- Bell, William Alfred, Budock and Falmouth, Corn Merchant. Pet Feb 26. Exeter, March 21 at 11. Sols Moorman, Falmouth, or Hirtel, Exeter.
- Berry, Edward, 2 De Beauvoir-rd, South Kingland, Middlesex, Wholesale Milliner. Pet March 3. London, March 18 at 12. Sols Peck & Downing, 10 Basinghall-st.
- Blaiz, John William, 51 Gloucester-st, Theobald's-road, Middlesex, Baker. Pet Feb 26. London, March 18 at 12. Sol Grayson, 43 Burton-crescent.
- Blake, William, 7 Margaret-st, Docks, Cardiff. Grocer. Pet March 1. Cardiff, March 17 at 11. Sol Wilcock, Cardiff.
- Bowen, Daniel, Meyrick-st, Pembroke Dock, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Feb 27. Pembroke, March 17 at 10. Sol Parry, Pembroke Dock.
- Bowman, Robert Blake, 28 Spencer-st, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, Watch Jeweller. Pet Feb 26. London, March 18 at 12. Sols Patterson & Son, 7 Bonaville-st, Fleet-st.
- Brimacombe, John Jordan, Holsworthy, Devonshire, Draper. Pet Feb 26. Holsworthy, March 22 at 11. Sol Coham, Holsworthy.
- Brydon, John, Harum, Yorkshire, Innkeeper. Pet March 1. Helmsley, March 14 at 2. Sol Jennings, Pickering.
- Calvert, George John, Edward Calvert, George Henry Loakine, and Francis Calvert, York, Ironfounders. Pet Feb 27. Leeds, March 24 at 11. Sols Unton & Yewdall, and Bond & Harwick, Leeds.
- Carter, Benjamin, Ribbles-dock, Worcestershire, Timber Merchant. Pet Feb 27. Kidderminster, March 15 at 11. Sol Hallen, Kidderminster.
- Chapman, James, Dalston, Cumberland, Labourer. Pet Feb 27. Carlisle, March 14 at 1. Sol Donald, Carlisle.
- Christon, John, Ingleton, Durham, Boot and Shoe Maker. Pet Feb 26. Barnard Castle, March 19 at 12. Sol Nixon, Hurworth.
- Clegg, Richard, 9 Albion-st, Rotherhithe, Surrey, Shipowner. Pet Feb 8. London, March 14 at 11. Sol Richardson, 15 Old Jewry Chambers, London.
- Cooper, Joseph, Longton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 26. Stoke-upon-Trent, March 15 at 11. Sol Adderley, Longton.
- Cousins, Charles, Croydon-common, Surrey, Greengrocer. Pet Feb 27. London, March 19 at 2. Sol Pittman, 94 Upper Stamford-st, Surrey.
- Cox, John, 15 Great Prescott-st, Goodman's-fields, Whitechapel, Middlesex, Publican. Pet Feb 27. London, March 19 at 11. Sol Silvester, 18 Dover-st, Southwark.
- Darcy, George, Canton Public-house, Landguard Fort, Folkestone, Suffolk, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 24. London, March 30 at 11. Sols Shireff & Son, 7 Lincoln's-lun-fields, London, and Pollard, Ipswich.
- Davies, Edward, High-st, Aldershot, Butcher. Pet Feb 28. London, March 19 at 11.30. Sol Muries, 3 Great James-st, Bedford-row.
- Davies, Thomas, Red Lion Public-house, Llanannan, Denbigh, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 26. Denbigh, March 13 at 11. Sol Williams, Denbigh.
- Dixon, James, 16 Queen's-rd, Bernersdsey, Journeyman Engineer. Pet Feb 26. London, March 18 at 12. Sol Swan, 2 Great Knighttrider-st, Doctors Commons.
- Dobbin, William, Station Hotel, Kirby, Cleveland, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 25. Stokesley, March 18 at 12. Sol Simpson, Yarm.
- Downs, Thomas, Callow-hill, Worcester, Higgler. Pet March 1. Kidderminster, March 19 at 2. Sol Best, Kidderminster.
- Dray, William, 72 Cannon-st, London, Ironmonger. Pet March 1. London, March 18 at 11. Sol May, 2 Adelaide-pl, London-bridge.
- Dring, William, Sheswood, Basford, Nottingham, Farmer and Milkman. Pet March 3. Nottingham, March 17 at 10. Sols Hawkridge & Heathcote, Nottingham.
- Eaton, Charles, High-st, Bampton, Oxford, Cooper. Pet Feb 27. Witney, March 18 at 11. Sols Bullen & Havenor, Witney.
- Fann, John William, Summer-villas, Arkwright-st, Nottingham. Pet March 1. Nottingham, March 17 at 10. Sol Ashwell Nottingham.
- Fennessy, William Parsons, 17 Victoria-grove, Kensington, Middlesex, Clerk in an Insurance Office. Pet Feb 28 (in forma pauperis). London, March 18 at 11. Sols Ody & Paddison, 3 New Boswell-st, London.
- Flack, Elizabeth, Sibley Heddingham, Essex, Seed Grower. Pet Feb 28. London, March 20 at 11. Sols Maddox & Wyatt, 3 Clements-lane, and Cardinal, Hatfield, Essex.
- Flaxman, Henry, Ipswich Arms Inn, Brook-st, Ipswich, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 28. Ipswich, March 14 at 11. Sol Moore, Ipswich.
- Fletcher, Thomas, Halsey-hill, near Halifax, Stone Mason. Pet Feb 28. Halifax March 21 at 10. Sols Norris & Foster, Halifax.
- Gowar, Thomas Welsh, 12 Took's-st Chambers, Curator-st, Middlesex, Law Stationer. Pet Feb 26 (in forma pauperis). London, March 19 at 11. Sol Harcourt, King's Arms-yd.
- Green, James, Bridge-st, Godalming, Assistant to a General Dealer. Pet Feb 12. Godalming, March 14 at 12. Sol White, Guildford.
- Gudger, Samuel, Linthwaite, Almondsbury, York, Tailor. Pet Feb 21. Huddersfield, March 30 at 10. Sol Jessop, Huddersfield.
- Gunnyn, Walter Phillips, Tower-buildings, Liverpool, Outfitter. Pet Feb 28. Liverpool, March 17 at 11. Sols Whitley and Thomson, Liverpool.
- Harrison, Joseph Martindale, 3 Park-pl, Loughborough-rd, Brixton, Surrey. Pet March 1. London, March 18 at 11. Sol Hall, 21 Coleman-st.
- Harrison, Thomas, Wigan, Provision Dealer. Pet Feb 27. Wigan, April 10 at 9. Sol Richardson & Hinnell, Bolton.
- Holmes, John Tapp, 37 Forster-st, New North-rd, Middlesex, Wholesale Milliner. Pet Feb 28. London March 20 at 11. Sols Fenton & Son, Bevois-st, Basinghall-st.
- Hopperton, William, 36 Hanway-st, Oxford-st, Middlesex, Assistant to a Dealer in Lace. Pet Feb 27 (in forma pauperis). London March 20 at 11.30. Sol Holt, quality-st, Chancery-lane.
- Hudson, Robert, Spring-lane, Sheffield, Broker. Pet Feb 28. Sheffield, March 20 at 2. Sol Broadbent, Sheffield.
- Hunt, James William, 165 Caledonian-rd, Islington, Middlesex, Hatter. Pet Feb 27. London, March 19 at 11. Sol Boulton, 21 Northampton-square.
- Jackson, Thomas, Giesabrough, Rotherham, Corn Miller. Pet Feb 26. Sheffield, March 15 at 10. Sols Smith & Burdick, Sheffield.
- Jenkins, Thomas, 1 Dispensary-st, Working-st, Cardiff, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Feb 26. Cardiff, March 17 at 11. Sol Dalton, Cardiff.
- Johnson, John, Chadlington West, Oxford, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 28. Chipping Norton, March 17 at 12.30. Sol Kilby, Banbury.
- Jones, John, Spencer-st, Everton, Liverpool, Builder. Pet March 1. Liverpool, March 15 at 11.30. Sols Evans, Son, & Sandys, Liverpool.
- Jordan, Henry William, 16 Church-st, Greenwich, Baker. Pet Feb 27. London, March 18 at 12. Sol Spiller, 3 South-pl, Finsbury.
- Kimberly, Edwin Nathan Bird, & Richard Gold, Birmingham, Hinge Makers. Pet Feb 23. Birmingham, March 24 at 12. Sols Hodgson & Allen, Birmingham.
- Loughton, George, Sheffield, Builder. Pet Feb 18. Sheffield, March 15 at 10. Sols Rodgers & Thomas, Sheffield.
- Leathers, Robert, 2 Chapel-st, Sonoma-town, Grocer. Pet Feb 28. London, March 18 at 12.30. Sols Royle & Son, 24 Bedford-pl, Russell-sq, London.
- Mathews, John Ross, Calverley-rd, Tonbridge-Wells, Upholsterer. Pet March 1. Tonbridge Wells, March 17 at 12. Sol Trustram, Tonbridge Wells.
- Miller, Josiah, 17 Garden-row, London-rd, Surrey, Baker. Pet Feb 24. London, March 18 at 11. Sol Waldron, 59 Lamb's Conduit-st.
- Moore, John George, Birmingham, Tobacconist. Pet Feb 28. Birmingham, March 17 at 12. Sol Brown, Birmingham.
- Morris, James, Lower Prospect-pl, Pembroke Dock, Shipwright. Pet Feb 27. Pembroke, March 17 at 10. Sol Parry, Pembroke Dock.
- Morris, Thomas White, Cottenham-st, Manchester, Commercial Clerk. Pet Feb 28. Manchester, March 15 at 10.30. Sol Swan, Manchester.
- Muddock, Charles Hickman, 68 Devonshire-rd, Holloway, Middlesex, Painter. Pet Feb 27 (in forma pauperis). London, March 18 at 11. Sol Holt, Quality-st, Chancery-lane.
- Murless, George, 22 Berry-st, Liverpool, Milliner. Pet Feb 27. Liverpool, March 13 at 12.30. Sols Evans, Son & Sandys, Liverpool.
- Norton, Joseph, 2 Rydon-crescent, St. John-st-rd, Islington, Artificial Florist. Pet March 2. London, March 30 at 11. Sol Padmore, 37a Bridge-rd, Lambeth, Surrey.
- Norrie, Isaac David, 67 Florence-rd, Kennington, Surrey, Bookkeeper. Pet Feb 27. London, March 18 at 11. Sols Lea & Sanders, Barge-yd, Bucklersbury.
- Pickles, Slater, 132 Boundary-pl, Bank Top, Blackburn, Grocer. Pet Feb 28. Blackburn, March 14 at 1. Sol Pickap, Blackburn.
- Pollard, Mary Anne, 7 Spa in the South Hamlet, Gloucestershire, Lodging-house Keeper, Widow. Pet March 1. Gloucester, March 15 at 2. Sol Chesshyre, Cheltenham.
- Randall, James, Emsworth, Southampton, Fisherman. Feb 18. Portsmouth, March 19 at 11. Sol Stening, Portsmouth.
- Ripley, Thomas, Emsworth, Southampton, Fisherman. Feb 18. Portsmouth, March 19 at 11. Sol Stening, Portsmouth.
- Rootsey, Harriet, 5 Charlotte-st, Fitzroy-sq, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet Feb 28. London, March 19 at 11.30. Sol Angell, Guildhall-yd.
- Shaw, Austin Cooper, Craven Hotel, Strand, and Brighton, Sussex, Veterinary Surgeon. Pet Feb 23. London, March 18 at 12. Sol Lomas, Carlton-chambers, Regent-st.
- Shaw, Edwin, 5 Alma-sq, Stretford, Lancashire, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Feb 26. Salford, March 15 at 10. Sol Richardson, Manchester.
- Short, Joseph, Poole, Plumber. Pet Feb 27. London, March 18 at 11. Sol Mardon, 99 Newgate-st, London.
- Sinclair, Arthur James, 37 Upper Thames-st, and 98 New Corn Exchange, London, Canvas, Tarpsaulin, and Sacking Factor. Pet Feb 21. London, March 18 at 1. Sol Jones, 15 Sise-lane, London.
- Sly, Richard, Pope-st, Birmingham, Journeyman Harness Furniture Maker. Pet Feb 27. Birmingham, March 21 at 10. Sol Duke, Birmingham.
- Smith, William, 33 Felton-st, Hoxton, Cabinet Maker. Pet Feb 27 (in forma pauperis). London, March 18 at 11. Sol Harcourt, King's-arm-yd.
- Sorby, John Richard, 163 Radnor-st, Hulme, Registrar of Births and Deaths. Pet March 1. Salford, March 19 at 10. Sol Ambler, Manchester.
- Southern, Thomas, Black Bull, Walton-rd, Kirkdale, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 28. Liverpool, March 15 at 12. Sol Cobb, Liverpool.
- Sprange, George, 5 Lonsdale-sq, Islington, Middlesex, Commercial Clerk. Pet Feb 27. London, March 18 at 11. Sols Lea, Turner, & Turner, 68 Aldermanbury, London.
- Steele, Elizabeth, Newcastle under-Lyme, and Henry Steele, Hanley, Upholsterers. Pet Feb 28. Birmingham, March 14 at 11. Sol Smith, Birmingham.
- Sill, James, 1 Hanover-ter, Brighton, Carpenter. Pet Feb 7. Brighton, March 10 at 11. Sol Runcunnes, Brighton.
- Storr, Henry, Brookspring-lane, Sheffield, Silversmith's Clerk. Pet Feb 28. Sheffield, March 20 at 2. Sol Binner, Sheffield.
- Summers, Elizabeth, Long Eaton, Derbyshire, Draper. Pet Feb 27. Nottingham, March 20 at 11. Sols Gamble & Leach, Derby.
- Taylor, Abraham, Abbey-st, Manchester, Common Brewer. Feb 12. Manchester, March 14 at 9.30. Sol Gardner, Manchester.
- Taylor, Thomas Young, Bolton, Rag and Waste Dealer. Pet Feb 28. Bolton, March 19 at 10. Sol Edge, Bolton.
- Templeman, Robert, Hare-lane, Gloucester, Grocer. Pet March 1. Gloucester, March 19 at 2. Sol Smalbridge, Gloucester.
- Tucker, Charles, & Edward Tucker, Jun, 9 New Bond-st, Bath, Attorneys-at-Law and Solicitors. Pet Feb 31. Bristol, March 17 at 12. Sols Abbott, Lucas, & Leonard, Bristol.
- Walker, George Edward, 63 Chapman-st, Oldham-rd, Manchester, Fruit Salesman. Pet Feb 27. Manchester, Feb 14 at 9.30. Sol Foster, Manchester.
- Watkins, Joshua, Cardiff, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 28. Bristol, March 21 at 11. Sol Henderson, Bristol.
- White, Mark, Mosborough, Ekeington, Derbyshire, Sickle Maker. Pet Feb 26. Chesterfield, March 14 at 11. Sol Patteson, Sheffield.
- Williams, Charles, New Weston-st, Bernersdsey, Surrey, Leather Factor. Pet Feb 28. London, March 18 at 12. Sols Linklaters & Hackwood, 7 Walbrook.
- Williams, John, Halesowen, Worcestershire, Blacksmith. Feb 24. Stourbridge, March 17 at 10. Sol Corries, Worcester.
- Wilson, Alfred, Leeds, Publican. Pet March 1. Leeds, March 14 at 11. Sol Simpson, Leeds.
- Wilson, John, Wood-st, New Radford, Nottinghamshire, Chemist and Druggist. Pet March 1. Nottingham, March 17 at 10. Sol Heathcote, Nottingham.
- Wood, James, 9 Barnley-st, Cambridge-heath-rd, and 36 Luke-st, Milleden Town, Middlesex, Carman. Pet Feb 27 (in forma pauperis). London, March 20 at 11.30. Sol Holt, Quality-st, Chancery-lane.
- Wyatt, James, 2 Copthall-bldgs, London. Pet Feb 26 (in forma pauperis). London, March 18 at 11. Sol Leader, 37 Newman-st, Oxford-st.



## UNITED KINGDOM LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY,

No. 8, WATERLOO PLACE, Pall Mall, LONDON, S.W.

### DIRECTORS.

The Hon. FRANCIS SCOTT, CHAIRMAN.

CHARLES BERWICK CURTIS, Esq., DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.

Edward Lennox Boyd, Esq. (Resident).  
 William Fairlie, Esq.  
 D. Q. Henriques, Esq.  
 J. G. Henriques, Esq.  
 Marcus H. Johnson, Esq.  
 A. H. Macdougall, Esq.  
 F. C. Maitland, Esq.  
 William Raitton, Esq.  
 Thos. Thorby, Esq., F.S.A.  
 Henry Toogood, Esq.

### SUPERIOR ACCOMMODATION AFFORDED BY THIS COMPANY.

This Company offers the security of a large paid-up capital, held in shares by a numerous and wealthy proprietary, thus protecting the assured from the risk attending mutual offices.

There have been three divisions of profits, the bonuses averaging nearly 2 per cent. per annum on the sums assured from the commencement of the Company.

Sum Assured.	Bonuses added.	Payable at death.
£5,000	£1,987 10	£6,987 10
1,000	379 10	1,397 10
100	39 15	139 15

To assure £100 payable at death, a person aged 21 pays £2 2s. 4d. per annum; but as the profits have averaged nearly 2 per cent. per annum, the additions, in many cases, have been almost as much as the premiums paid.

Loans granted on approved real or personal security.

Invalid Lives. Parties not in a sound state of health may be insured at equitable rates.

No charge for Volunteer Military Corps while serving in the United Kingdom.

The funds or property of the Company, as at 1st January, 1861, amounted to £730,655 7s. 10d., invested in Government and other approved securities.

Prospectuses and every information afforded on application to  
 E. L. BOYD, Resident Director.

### ESSEX.

The Gay Bowers Estate, near Danbury, only six miles from the capital market-town of Chelmsford, and about five miles from Maldon.

**MESSERS. DANIEL SMITH, SON, and OAKLEY** have received instructions from the Executors of the late Charles Downes, Esq., to SELL by AUCTION, at the CORN EXCHANGE, CHELMSFORD, on FRIDAY, MARCH 21, at TWO (unless previously disposed of by private contract), the above very valuable PROPERTY, with trifling exception freehold; comprising 200 acres of productive corn, very kind turnip and barley, and fine pasture land. It will be offered firstly in one lot, including the valuable manorial rights, and if not then sold, it will be divided so that the house, which is a very superior residence, will be surrounded by a very compact little domain, and will form the main lot. The remainder will be offered in lots, varying in extent, forming desirable separate occupations, or suitable additions to the estates of adjoining proprietors.

Particulars, with plans, may be obtained at the Saracen's Head, Chelmsford; at Mr. G. A. YOUNG'S Office, 34, Eagle-street, Red Lion-square, W.C.; at W. H. SKYNNER, Esq., 7, Cavendish-place, Cavendish-square; and of Messrs. DANIEL SMITH, SON, & OAKLEY, Land Agents and Surveyors, 10, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, S.W.

## TYLER AND COMPANY,

(Late Goodchap, Tyler, & Co.)

### ACCOUNTANTS,

13, GRESHAM STREET, E.C.

During a practice of twenty years, T. & Co. have had great experience in winding up Joint Stock Companies in Chancery; the investigation of intricate and disputed accounts; the liquidation of estates under deeds of inspection, assignment, and composition; and the audit of the accounts of public companies.

The management of estates under the New Bankruptcy Act undertaken. Terms moderate.

**CONSULTING ENGINEER.—JOHN IMRAY,**  
 M.A., author of a Treatise on Practical Mechanics and the Steam Engine. Advice on Patents, Inspection and Valuation of Machinery, Arbitrations, &c.  
 Address, 63, Bridge-road, Lambeth, S.

**ALBION SNELL,** Watchmaker and Jeweller, has removed to his New Premises, 114, High Holborn, seven doors east of King-street, where he respectfully solicits an inspection of his new and well-selected stock.

**COAL.—The GUINEA COAL COMPANY'S**  
 WALLEND'S all the year round, can only be obtained by addressing to the Secretary, Mr. JAMES JENNINGS, 7, York-road, King's-cross Station, N. Coke, 15s.

**KAMPTULICON OR ELASTIC FLOOR CLOTH,**  
 as made by GOUGH & BOYCE, the Original Patentees, and laid exclusively by them at the Houses of Parliament, and numerous other Public Offices. It is especially adapted for Churches, Mansions, Public Rooms, Shops, and Passages, being clean, warm, noiseless, dry, and economical.

GOUGH & BOYCE, 12, Bush-lane, Cannon-street, London. Forwarded to all parts of the Country.

## JOHN GOSNELL & CO., PERFUMERS TO THE QUEEN,

beg to recommend the following Fashionable and Superior Articles for the TOILET to the especial notice of all purchasers of Choice PERFUMERY.

John Gosnell & Co.'s JOCKEY CLUB PERFUME, in universal request as the most admired perfume for the handkerchief, price 2s. 6d.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE PERFUME—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GARIBALDI BOUQUET—a most choice and fashionable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s RUSSIAN LEATHER PERFUME—a very fashionable and agreeable perfume.

John Gosnell & Co.'s BALL-ROOM COMPANION or FOUNTAIN PERFUMES. Elegant Novelties, in the form of Portable Handkerchief Perfumes in a neat case, which emits on pressure a jet of most refreshing perfume. Price 1s. and 1s. 6d. each.

John Gosnell & Co.'s LA NOBLESSE POMADE—elegantly perfumed, and highly recommended for beautifying and promoting the growth of Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s GOLDEN OIL—Molline—Macassar Oil—Bears' rease, &c., for the Hair.

John Gosnell & Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a pearly-like whiteness, protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing fragrance to the breath.

John Gosnell & Co.'s AMBROSIAL SHAVING CREAM, 1s. and 1s. 6d. n pots; also, in compressible tubes, for the convenience of persons travelling; price 1s.

John Gosnell and Co.'s INSTANTANEOUS HAIR DYE—The only Hair Dye which produces a good natural colour with perfect certainty, and with the least possible trouble.

Manufactory, 12, Three King-court, Lombard-street, London.

## CHEDDAR LOAF CHEESE, 6½d., 7½d., and 8½d. per lb.

Ripe Stilton, 7d. to 1s. per lb.

Small Dautic Tongues, 3s. 6d. per half dozen.

Prime Ox ditto, 2s. 3d. each, or three for 6s. 6d.

Osborne's Peat-smoked Breakfast Bacon is now in excellent cure, and Butters in perfection, at reasonable rates; other first-class Provisions equally moderate; packages gratis.

### OSBORNE'S CHEESE WAREHOUSE,

Osborne House, 30, Ludgate-hill, near St. Paul's, E.C.

## GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH, USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

THE LADIES are respectfully informed that this STARCH is EXCLUSIVELY USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY.

And HER MAJESTY'S LAUNDRESS says, that although she has tried

WHEATEN, RICE, and OTHER POWDER STARCHES,

she has found none of them equal to the GLENFIELD, which is THE FINEST STARCH SHE EVER USED.

### WHEN YOU ASK FOR

## GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH,

See that you get it, as inferior kinds are often substituted.

WOTHERSPOON & Co., GLASGOW AND LONDON.

## SIR W. BURNETT, Director-General of the Medical

Department of the Navy, recommended BORWICK'S BAKING POWDER in preference to every other, for the use of Her Majesty's Navy, because it was more wholesome—more effective—would keep longer—and was in all respects superior to every other manufactured. Pleading testimonials as to its superior excellence have also been received from the Queen's Private Baker: Dr. Hassall, Analyst to the *Lancet*; Captain Allen Young, of the Arctic yacht "Fox," and other scientific men. Sold everywhere in 1d., 2d., 4d., and 6d. packets; and in 1s., 2s. 6d., and 5s. boxes.

When you ask for Borwick's Baking Powder, see that you get it, as complaints have been made of shopkeepers substituting worthless articles, made from inferior and inexpensive ingredients, because they are realizing a larger profit by them.

60,000 DEATHS OCCUR EVERY YEAR IN ENGLAND AND WALES BY CONSUMPTION ALONE.

**OZONIZED COD LIVER OIL** has been proved. at the Hospital for Consumption, Brompton, London, to be the nearest approach to a specific yet found for this fatal disease. The pulse is lowered, a far more generous diet may be taken, and the general health thereby unmistakably proved. See *Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society's Transactions*, Vol. 42, for 1859; *Lancet*, July 9, 1859; *Pharmaceutical Journal*, August 1, 1859, &c.

Prepared only by G. BORWICK, Sole Licensee, 21, Little Moorfields, London. Sold in 2s. 6d., 4s. 9d., and 9s. Bottles, by all Druggists.

## INTERESTING TESTIMONIAL IN FAVOUR

OF DR. LOCOCK'S PULMONIC WAFERS.—From Mr. T. J. Davis, Chemist, Rhosmaen-street, Llandilo.—"Gentlemen,—I send you the enclosed testimonial. Mr. Jenkins is well-known as a minister of the Gospel throughout the principality for thirty years. I sell more of Dr. Locock's Wafers than any other patent medicine. (Signed) T. J. Davis." Dr. Locock's Wafers give instant relief and a rapid cure of asthma, consumption, coughs, and all disorders of the breath and lungs. They have a pleasant taste. Price 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., and 17s. per box. Sold by all druggists. Beware of counterfeits.

